

THE
CHRISTIAN
REMEMBRANCER.

MAY, 1826.

REVIEW OF NEW PUBLICATIONS.

ART. I.—*Remarks on Dr. Henderson's Appeal to the Bible Society, on the Subject of the Turkish Version of the New Testament printed at Paris in 1819. To which is added, An Appendix, containing certain Documents on the Character of that Version. By the Rev. S. LEE, A. M. D. D. of the University of Halle, Honorary Member of the Asiatic Society of Paris, F. R. S. L. F. R. A. S. &c. and Professor of Arabic in the University of Cambridge. Cambridge: 1824. 8vo. pp. 184.*

The Turkish New Testament Incapable of Defence, and the True Principles of Biblical Translation Vindicated: in Answer to Professor Lee's "Remarks on Dr. Henderson's Appeal to the Bible Society, on the Subject of the Turkish Version of the New Testament printed at Paris in 1819." By the AUTHOR OF THE APPEAL. Rivingtons. 1825. 8vo. pp. 306.

SINCE our notice of an Appeal by Dr. Henderson to the Members of the British and Foreign Bible Society, on the subject of Ali Bey's translation of the New Testament into the Turkish Language, Remarks on Dr. Henderson's pamphlet have been published by Professor Lee, in the course of which, he endeavours to shew that the Doctor's criticisms are either unimportant or founded in error, and that the version in question "ranks among the best works of this kind, in the very close adherence which it has observed to the just principles of interpretation." To this work an Answer has been given by Dr. Henderson, triumphantly repelling the charges made against his "Appeal," by Professor Lee, and in our opinion convicting him in more than one instance of bold assertion without proof, and of such unfairness in argument as seems to indicate a consciousness of having undertaken the defence of an object unable to stand on the fair ground of its own merits. As an accusation of this nature should not be incautiously advanced, we shall shew, in the course of our observations, in what points we conceive the Professor to have avoided open discussion, and to have evaded the question in debate, instead of combating the positions of his adversary by a plain elucidation.

Much of the question turns upon the principles of translation, and on the liberty to which a translator may conceive himself

entitled of giving his own conceptions of the meaning of the original, where two opinions may exist on any point, in preference to such a literal translation as may leave the sense open to discussion in the version as in the original text.

Dr. Henderson lays it down as a rule that a translator should not depart in any case from that characteristic peculiarity of style which so eminently distinguishes the Scriptures, nor adopt technical and affected modes of expression equally foreign to the simplicity of the Sacred Writings and to the dignity of their subject; while at the same time he should carefully avoid the opposite defect, nor attach himself to the letter so far as to do violence to the idiom of the language into which he is translating. Equally avoiding an affected brevity and a turgid verbosity, he should be neither more obscure nor more perspicuous than the original. He says,

"It is no part of the business of a translator to explain or elucidate the sacred text: he is to give it exactly as it is, without attempting to render any part of it more intelligible to readers of the present day, than the Hellenistic style of the Apostolic writings was to the natives of Greece, or other parts of the world, to whom they were communicated in the early ages."—P. 31.

Professor Lee, on the other hand, is of opinion that the translator is in all cases permitted to paraphrase an elliptical passage, by adding any words he may conceive necessary to give his reader a clear idea of the sense of the original, and to amplify and add to any expression, so as to render his version more suitable to the preconceived notions of his readers. He supports his opinion by a quotation from Jerome, who, in his Epistle to Pammachius, speaking of the difficulties a translator has to encounter arising from the difference of idiom, observes that a verbal translation is frequently unintelligible, while a more free version would subject him to the accusation of unfaithfulness. What shall we say, however, of the accuracy or fairness of the Professor, when we learn that Jerome, in the same Epistle, after observing that he himself had usually adopted the principle of free translation, expressly excepts the Sacred Writings from the operation of this principle? Such, however, is the case, as Dr. Henderson has shewn.

"In producing the authority of Jerome relative to the best manner of translation, my opponent should not have omitted to notice, that the letter to Pammachius, containing the sentiments of that Father on the subject, was written in the heat of controversy, at a time when his mind was ruffled by the accusations of Rufinus, and cannot, therefore, be regarded as furnishing us with the cool and deliberate views of this learned man, on a subject with which he had rendered himself familiar, in a degree unequalled by any of the other Fathers. The circumstances of the case are these: certain letters from the Pope Epiphanius to John, Bishop of Jerusalem, having come into the hands of Eusebius of

Cremona, this monk, not understanding the language in which they were written, requested Jerome to furnish him with a translation of them. This task the Father performed in his usual hurried manner, 'Accitoque notario, raptim celeriterque dictavi,' not regarding the manner or style in which he made the translation, but merely executing it in such a manner as he thought sufficient to give Eusebius an idea of the contents of the original letters. It so happening, however, that Jerome's translation, which had been intended only to meet the eye of a private friend, came abroad; and, having found its way into the hands of his adversaries, a great handle was made of the manner of its execution. To justify himself from the aspersions thus thrown on his character, he wrote the epistle above referred to, *De optimo genere interpretandi*, in which, whatever he may have affirmed relative to the absurdity of translating *ad verbum*, we find the following remarkable words, which Professor Lee should by no means have omitted in his quotations: 'Ego enim non solum fateor, sed liberâ voce profiteor, me in interpretatione Græcorum, ABSQUE SCRIPTURIS SACRIS UBI ET VERBORUM ORDO MYSTERIUM EST, non verbum e verbo, sed sensum exprimere de sensu. Habeoque hujus rei magistrum Tullium, qui Protagoram Platonis, et Œconomicon Xenophontis, et Æschynis ac Demosthenis duas contra se orationes pulcherrimas transtulit: quanta in illis prætermisit, quanta addiderat, quanta mutaverit ut proprietates alterius linguæ suis proprietatibus explicaret, non est hujus tempore dicere.' Is it not evident from this passage, that what Jerome professedly treats of, is not the best manner of executing a *biblical translation*, but that to be adopted in translating *merely human writings*; and that, although, in the latter case, he conceived himself fully justified by the illustrious example of Tully, in omitting, adding, or changing, what he did not find congenial with modes of expression already established among the Latins; yet, he by no means considered himself authorized to take any such liberties with the word of God, in which he says *the very order of the words is a mystery?*"—P. 9—11.

After having adduced Jerome in support of his opinion, the Professor introduces Dathe, who says, "that version which translates word for word, is unworthy the name of a version." To this Dr. Henderson replies:

"I will not accuse Professor Lee of unfairness, though I certainly cannot exculpate him from the charge of criminal inattention, in applying to our present subject the words of Dathe, in his Preface to the minor Prophets. The direct tendency of the quotation introduced into the Remarks, from that able and judicious Scripture critic, is to impress the mind of the reader with an idea, that the principles of translation there laid down, were designed to bear upon popular versions of the Scriptures, and that his work was intended to serve as a model for the construction of such versions. Now this was by no means the case. Towards the conclusion of the very sentence preceding that with which the Professor's quotation commences, Dathe expressly declares, "*nec sine præviâ admonitione Lectorem admittere ad lectionem interpretationis, quæ a vulgari ratione haud parum recedit, et in quâ conficiendâ leges mihi scripsi, quas nolim lectores ignorare,*

quos judices *hujus versionis* habere cupiam.' And in his Preface to the Psalms, he says expressly; 'Idem enim consilium sequendum fuit, quod in cæteris universæ Veteris Testamenti versionis meæ partibus mihi proposueram, scilicet *ut verba Hebraica clare et perspicue redderem, quo hujus lingue studiosi quasi manu ducerentur ad textum originalem recte intelligendum et explicandum;*' which statement we find repeated in the Prefaces to the Pentateuch and Job. The fact is, as he himself informs us, it was his object to furnish a version corresponding to the second kind of translation proposed by Griesbach, as ranking next to what the great critic calls a public or Church version, namely, one which neither closely follows the letter of the text, nor swells out into paraphrase, but gives the ideas of the original, stripped of their Hebraistic forms, so as to be read with all the ease of original composition. It was designed, not for common readers, but for the learned, particularly such as were engaged in the study of the Hebrew original; consequently, the rules of translation, according to which it was conducted, and which are detailed in the Preface quoted by Professor Lee, cannot, with any degree of consistency, be urged as authority to determine the manner in which popular, or, as Griesbach calls them, public or Church versions, ought to be executed. Indeed, it is only necessary to glance at the otherwise highly valuable work of Dathe, to perceive its total unfitness to serve as a model of this kind of translation. Of this I shall adduce the following instances as a specimen. Hos. i. 2. *כי זנה הארץ מאחרי יהוה* 'For the land hath committed great whoredom against Jehovah.' Dathe translates thus; *Sic enim populus iste pro casto mei amore, alios deos amore impuro prosequitur.* ii. 16. *לכן הנה אנכי מפתיה וחלכתי המדבר* 'Notwithstanding I will allure her and lead her into the wilderness:' *Verum enim vero deinde eam ad saniozem mentem revocabo, atque in deserto, quo a me deducta est, &c.* iv. 4. *ועמך כמריבי כהן* 'And thy people are as they that strive with the priest:' *Omnes enim capitalium criminum rei sunt.* Habak. ii. 4. *צדיק באמונתו יחיה* 'But the just by his faith shall live:' *Sed pius propter illam fidem suam ejus implementum videbit.*"—P. 15—17.

The Professor, after this, taking advantage of the Doctor's rejection of the purely verbal manner above-mentioned, concludes that he and the Doctor are agreed on the principles of translation, and in consequence, dismisses a part of the question as unworthy of discussion. The Doctor, however, protests against this fancied agreement:

"Having thus shewn, to the satisfaction, I trust, of the impartial reader, that the authorities of Jerome and Dathe, as alleged in the Remarks, are altogether inapplicable to the argument relative to such versions of the sacred Scriptures as are designed for general use, it cannot be matter of surprise that I should hesitate to subscribe to the conclusion at which Professor Lee arrives, p. 15: 'The principle, therefore, adopted by the second class of translators, is that by which *we are agreed* that the merits of the question before us shall be tried; which is, indeed, the only one to which we can have recourse, whether we take the path which is obviously pointed out by the necessity of the

case, or are guided by the practice of the best translators, both of ancient and modern times.' How could it be expected that I should agree to decide the question by the principles or practice of liberal translators, when this was the very class which I so strongly condemned? And how can my rejection of the purely verbal manner, be fairly construed into an approval of the opposite extreme? The necessity of the case will, I believe, be found to be of so pressing a nature as to require a perfect accommodation of the language of the Bible, to exactly the same forms of speech which previously exist among mankind: to judge from the best popular versions, of which our own stands in the foremost rank, it does not appear to be at all impossible to retain much of the characteristic stamp of the original phraseology, and to follow the sacred writers, *κατὰ πόδα*, while, at the same time, no violence is done to the genius of the vernacular tongue, but, on the contrary, it acquires, by this very means, no inconsiderable accessions of strength, beauty, dignity, and sublimity."—Pp. 17, 18.

In the second chapter of the "Answer," Dr. Henderson explains more fully his views of the principles of biblical translation, and shews how much Ali Bey has departed from those principles. With regard to the matter of the version, it is required that it exhibit the genuine sense of the original; that it furnish a complete transcript of the ideas conveyed by the original; that it contain no supernumerary ideas, nor convey a single shade of meaning more than is suggested by the original. With respect to the manner, it should be clear and accurate, chaste and simple, perspicuous, uniform, and pure. He supports his views of the subject by the authorities of Lowth, Batteaux, Griesbach, and Huet. Speaking of the importance of the literal mode of translating, he observes,

"The importance of the *literal* mode of translation must be obvious from three considerations:—First, it operates as a curb upon the translator, and prevents the intermixture of human ideas and the technical phraseology of different nations with the pure mind of the Spirit of God, and the peculiar modes of expression by which He was pleased to reveal it to mankind. Secondly, it secures the unlearned reader from being reduced to the necessity of placing his faith in the wisdom of men, and not in the power of God, which worketh by means of his word. By having a close and accurate version put into his hands, his judgment is not forestalled, but he is left to gather the sense from the translation, much in the same way as those did to whom the original was at first delivered. Thirdly, it is highly important that all public versions of the Scriptures should be literal, because they form the text-book of missionaries and ordinary pastors of churches. Were we to regard the Bible merely as a repertory of mottos to be prefixed to sermons, it might indeed be a matter of indifference, whether the translation be free or literal; but if religious teachers imitate the apostles in opening and expounding the contents of Scripture, and 'rightly dividing the word of truth,' it is necessary both for themselves and their hearers, that the version which thus forms the basis of public

instruction, should be in a high degree faithful and accurate."—Pp. 28, 29.

The first charge brought by Dr. Henderson against the Turkish version, was the addition of useless epithets to the Deity; shewing that instead of the simple word Allah, Ali Bey had employed such expressions as Divine Majesty, Supreme Divinity, Illustrious Verity, and various others. This variety of translation the Professor does not deny; but instead of openly meeting the question of propriety in thus uselessly encumbering the divine name, he merely cavils at Dr. H.'s translations of the epithets used by Ali Bey, and proposes others, some of which are perhaps more etymologically correct than those given by the Doctor; but in general, they are nearly synonymous. In some instances, the Professor's explanations place the object in a more ludicrous point of view than those of Dr. Henderson. An instance of puerile cavilling occurs, "Remarks," p. 20, where the Professor says that *تعالی* will not bear the sense of *supreme*, but only means *exalted*. Speaking of the word *حضرت* he says, p. 27, that it means neither *majesty*, nor *highness*, nor *lordship*, nor *ladyship*; but that he does not mean to argue, that the word has not been translated so occasionally, or that the translations have not been sufficiently accurate for general readers. However, leaving the question of mistranslation, he boldly affirms that Ali Bey has acted properly in translating as he has done; that the Turks would conceive great disrespect were paid to God, if his name were unaccompanied by the terms the Doctor objects to; and asserts, that in all Mahometan books of any value, the word Allah, 99 times in 100, is followed by *taala*. Now we own, that in the Turkish works we have read, a great difference in this respect is observable, and that some authors, but generally those of least repute, are very fond of crowding with epithets every word that could possibly admit of them; but we do not hesitate to say that the word Allah, so far from being followed by *taala* 99 times in 100, is found more often alone, than accompanied with any epithet whatever. This gratuitous assertion of the Professor is thus answered by Dr. Henderson:

"The next position that is taken in defence of the expression *الله تعالی* Allah *taála*, is the practice of Mohammedans. It is laid down as a maxim, not to be controverted, that 'the best Mohammedan writers alone can be relied on in questions of this kind; and by their decisions must we be governed in this.' 'Now I will venture to affirm,' adds Professor Lee, (and it may almost be deemed excusable in the public to regard his affirmations on 'questions of this kind' as semi-oracular,) 'that in all the Mohammedan books of any value, whether written in the Arabic, Persic, Turkish, Hindostanee, or Malay languages, the word *الله* Allah is ninety-nine times, at least, in every

hundred, followed by the word *تعالى* *ta'āla*, p. 21. Of the frequency with which this combination occurs in the compositions of Mohammedans, I am not altogether ignorant; but that the nonadecimal mode of computation here insisted on, will prove more successful in this instance than it does elsewhere in the Remarks, is not quite so indubitable. The Koran, I believe, will be allowed, at least by Mohammedans, to be 'a book of some value;' yet, from beginning to end of the original, I fear it would rather puzzle the Arabic Professor to find ten or even five passages in which the combination *الله تعالى*

Allah ta'āla occurs, although it be a fact, that *الله* *Allah* alone, unaccompanied by any adjunct whatever, is scattered, like the stars in the firmament, with the greatest profusion over almost every page of the volume. It is true, we are taught, Surah vii. 172. that 'God hath most excellent names,' and that he ought to be invoked by the same; and the Mohammedans estimate their sum total at ninety-nine; but the style of the Koran is, in this respect, nearly analogous to that of the Old and New Testament, the Divine Being commonly receiving the appellations *الله* *Allah*, *God*, and *رب* *Rabb*, *Lord*; while the other names are used declaratively of his attributes, much in the same way as in our Scriptures, where God is described as *merciful* and *gracious*, *long-suffering*, &c."—Pp. 69, 70.

The Doctor goes on to shew that Ali Bey himself, notwithstanding the irreverence alleged by Professor Lee, frequently omits the influential epithet, for half a dozen verses together, and sometimes for whole chapters and even epistles; thus proving that there is no necessity for their insertion. This the Professor himself admits, after all his endeavours to shew that a writer would be guilty of irreverence in omitting them; and it may not be superfluous to observe that Professor Kieffer, who published the edition under examination, is now publishing an edition of the Old Testament of Ali Bey, from which he has carefully expunged all extraneous expressions, such as those alluded to. His opinion is therefore decidedly against the propriety of their introduction.

With regard to the argument employed by Professor Lee, that the practice of the Greek Christians in Turkey (who frequently use such epithets) is decisive on this point, the Doctor very properly observes, that because an oppressed people living in a Mohammedan country is obliged to conform in some measure to Mohammedan customs and language, that language does not therefore cease to be Mohammedan, and that the notorious ignorance of the Greeks will prevent any one from adducing their example as decisive on this or any other question in biblical science.

We now come to a more grave accusation than the mere amplification of style, or capricious variety of language; and that is, the tendency of this version to weaken the proofs of the

divinity of Christ. The Doctor has shewn, and this has not been denied by Professor Lee, that Ali Bey has repeatedly used words which can only be applied to God exclusively, where, in the original, the word refers, not to God absolutely considered, but to our Lord and Mediator Jesus Christ. The Doctor infers from this, that Ali Bey has thereby much weakened the doctrine of our Saviour's divinity. The Professor denies that any such consequence can arise from this circumstance, and argues, on the contrary, that this very reference of the acts of Jesus to God alone, constitutes a strong proof of his divinity. As some misconception seems to have prevailed on this point, it will be necessary here to make a few observations. It may possibly appear that a version of the Testament in which Christ should be designated by a term exclusively applicable to God, instead of diminishing the proofs of our Lord's divinity, would rather confirm it, and would place his divine nature in a more conspicuous point of view. Professor Lee seems to view the question in this light, and says that such a word used to designate the acts of any person, necessarily attribute divinity to that person; and consequently, that Dr. Henderson has proved directly the reverse of what he intended. But it will appear, on a closer investigation, that in many instances, some of which the Doctor has pointed out, instead of conveying to the mind of the reader the idea of Christ, this exclusive term refers to the Deity alone, leaving the idea of our Lord quite out of the question. Dr. Henderson gives several instances of this, one of which will be sufficient to shew that such is the case. "Whosoever shall call upon the name of the Lord shall be saved;" Rom. x. 13. In this example, the change of "the Lord" into "God" obviously gives the passage quite a different tendency from its original signification, and destroys the proof it contains of the divinity of our Saviour; as the passage, so altered, is a dogma that will be denied neither by Christian nor Mahometan of whatever designation.

The Professor attempts to shew, that no other word could have been employed in all those cases, which would have given that idea the Doctor would wish to be inculcated, and asserts that the word رَبّ, equally with الله and other terms used by Ali Bey, would only be applied to God exclusively. He endeavours to support this assertion by the best oriental authority; but, conscious of the untenable nature of the ground he has chosen, his observations apply only to the emphatic term اَلرَّبّ and not to the simple رَبّ. Now those terms are in their application totally different; اَلرَّبّ referring, as Dr. H. admits, only to God; and رَبّ being frequently used to designate a Lord or

Master. We need not follow the Doctor into the various quotations from oriental writers, from which he proves most satisfactorily that **رب** is very often so employed; it will be sufficient to observe, that Ali Bey himself has frequently used it as applied to Christ, in cases which absolutely exclude all idea of divinity from the minds of the persons who use it; and even as applied to angels, as Acts x. 4, Cornelius, addressing the angel, says, **ربنا، يا رب،** *ne var ia rab*, "What is it, Lord?" using the word **رب** precisely in the same sense as the Greek word *Κύριε*, Master or Lord. Professor Lee himself, with a strange inconsistency, after having so strenuously contended for the restricted meaning of **رب**, says ("Remarks," p. 102), that the disciples of John could not be supposed to be acquainted with the divinity of our Lord, even had they addressed him by the dignified title **رب**.

Among other passages adduced in the "Appeal," by Dr. Henderson, to shew the tendency of the translation to weaken the proofs of our Saviour's divinity, he mentions Rom. ix. 5, *ὁ ὢν ἐπὶ πάντων Θεὸς εὐλογητὸς εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας*, thus translated, **اولئك جملته نك اوزرينه ابدًا متبارك الاله در** and observes, that by using the word **الاله** the version merely says that Christ is an object of praise, which is already acknowledged by Mahometans, and adds no proof whatever of his divinity. Now the fact is, and of this the Professor cannot be ignorant, the word **الاله** without the article, means any object of worship, whether an idol or a deity, and **الله** with the article, can only mean the true God. In the instance before us, Professor Lee says that the idea attached to the word **الاله** will depend chiefly upon the religion of the reader; and as neither Christians nor Mahometans acknowledge any but the true God, the word in question can convey no other meaning. But surely a Mahometan or Christian must be very uninformed, who does not know, that many nations admit of a number of inferior deities and objects of worship, to say nothing of the fact, that in the very book under consideration, the gods of the heathen are frequently mentioned; and a Mahometan, though he acknowledges no other object of worship than the true God, may he not, on seeing a word used to designate Christ, which he has before seen employed as an appellation of an inferior being, suppose that even in their own Bible the Christians have no authority for making Christ equal with God; and will it not confirm him in the idea, not unfrequently entertained by Mahometans, that the Christians worship a

plurality of Gods? Such would certainly be the case; and Professor Kieffer, probably apprehensive of such a result, has very properly cancelled the page in question, and reprinted it []

In the seventh chapter, Dr. H. resumes the subject of synonyms, and cites the opinions of several biblical critics, whose judgment must be decisive on this point. It will be unnecessary to enter into a discussion on this subject, as we believe it to be universally acknowledged, except by the learned Professor, that even in works of a much less important stamp than the holy Scriptures, the adoption of synonymous terms by a translator, to express the sense of one word in the original, must at least weaken the spirit and alter the style of the author, and in some cases, such as those pointed out by the Doctor in this chapter, obscure and even subvert the sense of the original. We shall therefore proceed to comment on a few of the "false renderings" defended by Professor Lee.

Passing over the application of the word *jumâ* to Friday, which, however improper, has been generally adopted in oriental versions of the New Testament, we come to the term *bazarguun*, or market-day, applied to Sunday. It will probably be unnecessary in this country to comment on the incongruity of such an appellation, which, however it may appear to Professor Lee, certainly seems to give apostolical authority for such an appropriation of the day. The Professor asserts that the term Lord's day would be unintelligible to Mahometans, who, he says, would understand by it God's day. What has already been observed in speaking of the word *رب* would perhaps be decisive on this point; but Dr. H. has very properly convicted the Professor of mistake, at least, by shewing that in this very version the word *رباني* is used in connexion with *عشا* as applied to the Lord's supper. The Professor allows, indeed, that at some future period, the appellation might be altered to advantage, though he doubts whether a better term could be used at present; which is saying, in other words, that of two terms, one appropriate and the other unsuitable, he should for the present prefer the latter, as by the frequent use of an improper term, the reader would become acquainted with the signification of one more proper. We confess we are not convinced by such an argument.

Another rendering defended by Professor Lee, is that of "Sweetmeats of Omnipotence," used for "manna." In this instance, the Professor adverts to the usage of the Germans, who, he *seems* to say, translate the word *manna* by *himmelbrod*, bread of heaven. We say, "*seems* to say," because he has not actually asserted that they do so use the term, knowing it to be

untrue, but certainly such was our impression on reading his observation; and until we had examined the German Testament, we had no doubt, judging from the apparent meaning of the Professor's words, that they had so done. As to the preference given by Ali Bey to the terms *قدرت حلواسي* because the word

من is used to designate a medicine, if Professor Lee had looked a little farther, he would have found the term used by Ali Bey himself in other parts of his version, which are pointed out by Dr. Henderson; but the universal practice of oriental nations, and even the Koran itself, have so far sanctioned the use of the

term *من* that nothing but a love of paraphrase and meretricious ornament could have induced a translator to employ any other expression. We shall only mention one more passage, to shew how careless in his assertions the Professor has proved himself, in the course of his observations on this work. Dr. Henderson had remarked in his Appeal, that the important words *μετα του πατρος μου*, Rev. iii. 21, had been omitted in the translation. Professor Lee on this observes as usual, that the omission is of no consequence; that the passage is as well understood as if the words had remained there, &c. &c.; and refers to Griesbach's edition of the New Testament to prove "that several valuable Greek manuscripts" omit the words in question. As Griesbach's work is probably in the hands of every biblical critic, it may have been hardly thought worth while to examine the truth of the assertion, as one could scarcely suppose that Professor Lee, in support of an inaccuracy, would refer to a book universally known and so easily procured: what then will be the reader's surprise to find, on referring to it, that not one Greek manuscript is cited by Griesbach varying in the slightest degree from the received text, and that the only variations from it (*viz.* an Armenian version and a Latin one) do not omit the words in question. Really the Professor would act more wisely to cite only such books as are with difficulty procured, or to cite with more plausibility in future.

With regard to the foreign authorities brought forward by the Professor, to support his opinion of the version before us, we shall only observe, that however learned in Asiatic literature they may be, and some of them undoubtedly are, they generally appear quite unaccustomed to any thing like biblical criticism; that they do not at all touch on the more important objections; and that several of the remarks are admissions of the truth of Dr. H.'s criticisms. One of them, Mr. Langles, writes, that a Persian assured him the word *Hæzret* was employed "only for Jesus." This the Doctor very properly stigmatizes as a *bare-faced falsehood*—Ali Bey's New Testament affording instances, in the very first chapter, of the word being employed to designate the Virgin Mary, Abraham, and Solomon.

It will be unnecessary to carry the subject to greater length. We will only observe, that, to fill up the measure of misrepresentation, Professor Lee has given us a professed literal translation of an important part of Ali Bey's version of the Old Testament, in order to enable the reader to form an opinion of its accuracy. The reader probably will be surprised to hear, that, by some unaccountable mistake, as we should charitably suppose, this translation is done, not from Ali Bey's manuscript, but from the corrected text of Professor Kieffer, in which every thing extraneous and supplementary was, by order of the Bible Society, omitted. *Ex uno disce omnia.*

We shall conclude by the observation, that if such principles of criticism as those avowed by Professor Lee be admitted by the Bible Society; if the examination of the versions made by their authority be committed to persons advocating such principles, and adapting them to the works entrusted to their care; the Bible Society, instead of being the fountain whence is to be derived the propagation of a knowledge of the gospel throughout the world, will be the means of increasing the existing ignorance of the real import of the Sacred Writings, and will undoubtedly augment the dislike and opposition to their reception, which misrepresentation and ignorance have already produced.

ART. II.—*A Visit to the Rectory of Passy; with Sketches of Character and Scenery.* Hatchard. 8vo. pp. 228. 1826.

ALTHOUGH this little work is not of a theological character, we do not hesitate to call the attention of our readers to it; for we are sure they will find in it much that will please, something that will instruct. The author informs his readers, that the characters, as well as the incidents, are real; and that, though some circumstances connected with each of the former have been changed, the alteration is too slight to affect the general truth and fidelity of the portraits. This we deem of no little importance; for knowing that the plans which the "Rector of Passy" successfully adopted for the improvement of his flock, have been carried on in real life, we may adopt them under similar circumstances with some confidence of a like result. After noticing the success which had attended his exertions, he makes the following observations, remarkable for their excellent spirit.

"It has been far greater than I could have reasonably expected. Many circumstances proved favourable, and I regarded them as providential interferences for the blessing both of the pastor and his people. Perhaps, too, the change appears to you greater than it really

is. Immoral families are yet to be found in Passy, as in other places. I reprove, exhort, and admonish these, patiently, repeatedly, and affectionately; my endeavours are variously received—sometimes with attention, more frequently with silence and indifference; I desire to be thankful that I can add, never with rudeness, and that my labours amongst those who appeared most hopeless, have not been entirely without success; and I cherish a hope that a more abundant blessing will yet be granted me. The husbandman bearing precious seed may go forth weeping, but the seed shall not be sown in vain. It shall prosper in that to which it is sent, and bring forth fruit to the praise of our Redeemer. After the greatest vigilance and closest investigation, we remain very ignorant of the real state of our flocks. This is only known to the great Searcher of hearts; could we see as he sees, how many splendid professors, whom we are apt to regard as lights in the world, would be evident as deceived themselves and deceiving others; and how far more numerous would be that class of humble, fearful, and modest disciples, who, shunning the gaze of men, walk humbly and submissively before their God all their days, serving him with fervour of heart; whose light, though bright as that of a candle, is obscured and hidden by the narrowness of the sphere in which they move; placed, as it were, under a bushel, it is hardly known or perceived, but still it exists, and shines in its contracted circle, and shall be approved in that day when God shall bring secret things to light.”—Pp. 82, 83.

The duties of a mother with respect to her infant charge are ably depicted in the character of Mrs. Christie. We are quite sure the conductors of our Infant Schools would do well to adopt her principles.

“Perhaps there is no relation in life more important than that of a mother: certainly none more difficult, though so few feel their inability faithfully to perform its duties. Mrs. Christie’s talents are no less evident here than elsewhere. That blind obedience to authority, which is frequently the only principle carefully instilled into the minds of children, forms no part of her system of education. She considers and treats them as beings possessed of reason, though weak and imbecile, and which it is her duty to strengthen and cultivate. Thus, while she carefully restrains them from every thing evil or injurious, she assiduously explains to them the reason of every restriction. The necessity of exertion is inculcated by so many familiar proofs of the benefits connected with it, that I believe few young persons have grown up more sensible of the blessings of activity, or skilled in the employment of their energies, than her sons and daughters. ‘I apprehend,’ continued the Rector, ‘your principles of education would be found nearly to coincide with those of this lady.’ ‘The intellects of my children,’ she would say, ‘are to come up to the level of mine; then it is my duty to exert that influence which will most surely contribute to this effect;—their reason is weak, exercise will strengthen it;—they are liable to impressions, I must take care that they receive only good ones;—they are now free from prejudice, I must watch to prevent there being any planted there;—they are

now open to instruction, I will endeavour to communicate it ;' and the facility with which she can instil principles, explain consequences, and make her ideas harmonize with those of her pupils, is very surprising."—Pp. 61, 62.

Such of our clerical brethren as have the charge of parishes in the country, will read with pleasure the following account of the Rector's labours,—a part only of a very interesting chapter. We may observe, the importance of an evening service in the church, notwithstanding some inconveniences which attend it, is evident to all who have adopted it. The poor always gladly avail themselves of it; nor is it surprising. Their homes afford not the same facilities for reading and meditation that our's do; they are better qualified to be attentive hearers, than attentive readers.

"I frequently had occasion to observe how much the youth of a village are exposed to temptation on a Sunday evening, from the want of something to engage their attention, and how frequently they are induced, from mere listlessness, to fall into practices or amusements quite unsuited to the day, and which often lead to the worst habits. At the beginning of my third summer, I opened the church on Sunday evenings, at that hour which seemed least likely to interfere with those duties which necessarily attach to servants in an agricultural district. I have always been careful to confine this service to an hour's duration; I read the prayers, and explain in a very plain and familiar manner, a portion of Scripture, always illustrating it by frequent examples, and these drawn from the Bible as much as possible. In my first attempts I went through a course of lectures on the Liturgy; the small number which then attended met in the chancel; they occupied a few forms, and I took my station at their head, as if I was the master of the family assembled for domestic worship. The service proved acceptable, and in a few weeks the attendance increased so much, that the chancel would no longer hold it, and we were obliged to adjourn to the church.

"I had only intended it as a summer duty; but when that season had passed away, I received an application from some of the inhabitants, chiefly the farmers, who thought it had been useful in preserving their servants from many evils to which they had before been exposed, to continue the lectures during the winter, and engaging to find candles at their own expense. I could not but be gratified at this expression of approval of my labours, and disposition to receive instruction; I joyfully complied.

"I inquired what course of instruction he had found most beneficial for such a service.

"He answered: 'When I had finished the explanation of the Liturgy, I went through the Homilies, making a few remarks on each, relative to the circumstances of the church at the period of their publication, and the particular views of the Reformers; when I had finished these, I commented on the Gospels, and then the Epistles, as selected for our Communion Service. The Sunday lessons fur-

nished me with subjects for a long period; since then I have again gone over the Liturgy and Homilies.

“‘In this duty I have always adopted the paraphrastic mode of instruction, drawing conclusions and making a suitable application. I think no part of our sabbath engagements has been more beneficial: from a careful review of my labours, I feel convinced that the explanatory is the most useful method of teaching the lower classes, which always form the largest and most important part of our flocks. A subject discussed in a sermon through all its bearings, is far from being best suited to them: they have not the education necessary to enable them to follow such a course, nor to understand operations and deductions, never exemplified to them in their limited sphere of action; nor have they the habit of investigation required to derive the greatest profit from that sort of teaching. Read to them a large portion of scripture, explain it clearly and familiarly, illustrate it by examples, show the consequences and apply them to their consciences; instruction administered in this form will be remembered and reflected upon during the week, whilst engaged in their respective occupations, and the effects will be evident.’

“‘I hinted that I thought our Saviour had powerfully sanctioned this mode of teaching, by his own practice during his ministry on earth.

“‘I am decidedly of that opinion,’ returned the Rector; ‘almost all his instructions seem to have originated from, or to have been connected with, present circumstances. In that beautiful discourse on the Mount, the most perfectly detailed of any of his recorded addresses, there is scarcely a sentence which does not appear to have been suggested by something present; the immediate and familiar improvement of which was calculated to make a powerful and permanent impression on his auditors.’”—P. 79—81.

The following dialogue on the Education of the Poor, though it contains nothing new, sets forth in a pleasing and perspicuous manner the advantages accruing to society from it, and the duty of the rich to promote the system.

“Mr. Saville was engaged in maintaining that the extension of education among the poor, however gratifying it might be to the best feelings of those who participated in it, was inimical to the interests of society. Though an excellent magistrate, I found he was one of those who had imbibed a principle—once prevalent, but now generally and happily exploded—that ignorance is the parent of obedience, and that the only method to ensure the submission of the inferior ranks of society, is to deprive them of those instructions which might enable them to rise above it. ‘I do not doubt,’ said he to the Rector, ‘the benevolence of your intentions, and those of your coadjutors, but consider the effect your exertions will have on society; these children are all taught to read, their future masters and mistresses will not be able to lay down a letter or a memorandum but they will become acquainted with its contents, and many particulars of which it is the interest of the former that they should be ignorant. All that have inclination and can find time to come to the evening-school, which you have attached to your sunday-school, you teach writing and arithmetic: the former

spoils them for being servants, and the latter raises them above their station. Every one of them will say, 'Why should I continue in service? I can keep accounts, I will be a clerk;' and so they become saucy and independent, and society is injured: perhaps it will be finally subverted by these ill-advised though well-intentioned measures.'

" 'I think,' answered Mr. Llewellyn, 'your apprehensions arise from having only partially considered the subject. If all the lower orders are qualified for clerks' places, they cannot all obtain them, because their universal qualification will not add one to the number of such appointments; when these are filled, those who remain disengaged must take themselves to different employments such as they can find, and for these, their superior qualifications will certainly make them more desirable. I have never felt inconvenience from my servant being better, though I have suffered from his being worse qualified than I wanted.'

" 'But,' replied the magistrate, 'what made him worse? Was it not his being too wise for his station, which made him a spy upon and dissatisfied with his master?'

" 'No, indeed,' replied Mr. Llewellyn, 'my complaints of servants have never originated from that cause. All my letters or papers of business I think it my duty to preserve with care; and those which are merely complimentary, or engagements, may be read by them or any other; that will never injure any one. I have found the vices, not the knowledge of my dependants, my trouble; and the effect of instruction, if properly directed, is, to teach men to be sober, faithful, and diligent. Education, as it raises the subject of it above the effects of ignorance, so it tends to encourage those qualities essential to the formation of a good servant.

" 'The result which you apprehend,' continued Mr. Llewellyn, 'of the lower ranks being raised above their station, can only take place even partially, whilst the diffusion of education is partial: when all of that class shall have received the rudiments of a common education, they will be put upon nearly the same level as if they had been left in ignorance, as far as respects their claims of preferment. As regards society, those among them who possess great abilities will have that gross ignorance removed, which presents the only insuperable barrier to their advancement: the means of further instruction are easy to those who, having gained the first principles of learning, have talents and energy to pursue it: and how much is the general welfare of mankind promoted by giving such men an opportunity to exercise their abilities, which, though employed for their private advantage, must benefit the public? Why are the comforts of society and moderate prosperity more generally diffused in this than in any other country, but because every sort of talent, in every rank of life, is more easily exercised here than elsewhere?'

" 'I will only make one observation,' said the Rector, 'the truth of which I think our worthy friend will admit, even in spite of the dislike which he feels to our practice. As accountable beings, he will allow that it is of the utmost importance, that all should have the means of becoming acquainted with the will of that God on whom we are dependant, and by whom we are to be judged. This equally concerns the

rich and the poor man ; the latter, therefore, as well as the former, ought to be enabled to read the Scriptures ; from them he learns to know the will of his heavenly Master, and it is absurd to suppose that a man will do his duty worse because he knows it better ; or that fearing God, he will be less careful so to serve his master as to please God.'

" ' I will not admit that,' said Mr. Saville ; ' our servants, when ignorant, did their duty and never thought about it, and that is much better than being full of notions of it, and never doing it.'

" ' I grant,' said Mr. Llewellyn, ' that if a man knows his duty and does not do it, he is a worse man in every relation of life than another, who being ignorant of the principles of it, falls—how you do not explain—into the practice of it ; but such an occurrence is beyond all expectation—a man who should defend it would be deemed insane. I might say, a man who is no mechanic may be supposed, by mere accident, to have constructed a watch, or other nice piece of machinery, which correctly answered its intention ; it is possible, but it would be very marvellous, and never could be expected to occur a second time ; and I believe, upon the assurance that such a man had done so, neither you nor any one would be prevailed upon to employ him for a similar purpose, when you could have the services of a well-taught and able mechanic. The latter, you would say, has the principles and knowledge of his art, I can depend upon him ; the other is ignorant, and it would be absurd in me to trust him. Your untaught servant may do his duty to you, but he has neither principles to influence, nor rule to guide him ; on the contrary, he who is instructed in his religious duties, like the skilful mechanic, is entitled to your confidence, because he is wise in his holy calling.'

" ' All mechanics,' interposed the magistrate, ' do not act upon the same principles ; there are a variety of religious and good men to be found in all of them ; some do not allow the Bible, therefore it is not requisite that all should read it.'

" ' It seems very extraordinary,' replied Mr. Winston, ' if the Bible is not necessary, that God should have revealed it. In all his works we observe the greatest economy, nothing bestowed or employed in vain, and these displays of his power are exerted without difficulty or danger to any of his creatures. But if your argument is true, not only has God made a revelation of himself, and his will, which is superfluous, but he has commanded the knowledge of it to be propagated throughout the world at the greatest hazard ; and of those who have been thus engaged, many have done it to the loss of their comfort and even life, believing that so doing they were fulfilling the commands of its Divine Author, who evidently requires such fidelity of them, promising to reward those who are faithful to death, and declares that those who draw back, by so doing, incur perdition.'

" ' Your reasoning is strong,' returned Mr. Saville, ' and I do not mean to deny that the Bible may be necessary to some, who may sufficiently explain it to produce a good effect upon others ; but when the comforts of life are at stake, and we see good men of all religions, some of whom only thus impart its contents through the medium of teachers privileged for that purpose, we ought to be satisfied, and careful how we risk our advantages.'

"Mr. Hale here enquired whether the worthy magistrate did not speak rather more extensively than he had intended. 'Moral men,' he observed, 'are occasionally found among all professions, but the religion of the Gospel alone can be relied on to make good men.'"

We have not taken up this work as critics: we have been pleased by the perusal of it, for we have found its narratives abound with liberality, good sense, and piety; and we think such of our readers as refer to it will participate in our sentiments.

SERMON.

VICTORY OVER THE WORLD.

"Whatsoever is born of God overcometh the world: and this is the victory that overcometh the world, even our faith. 1 JOHN v. 4.

IN the discourses of our blessed Lord, and in the writings of his Apostles, especially in those of the beloved disciple, St. John, we find frequent mention of the world, as opposed to God, and to the religion of Jesus Christ. We are told not to love the world, neither the things that are in the world. If any man love the world, the love of the Father is not in him. The Apostle explains himself in the following words: "For all that is in the world,—the lust of the flesh, the lust of the eye, and the pride of life,—is not of the Father, but is of the world." The world then, which is contrary to God, is comprehended under three heads: sensual pleasures, earthly riches, and pride or vain-glory. From this definition it is easy to determine what St. John means when he speaks of overcoming the world. He means the suppressing all inordinate desires of the pleasures, honours, and riches of this world; the resisting and renouncing them as far as they interfere in the slightest degree with the principles or business of religion; for then they are to be considered in the light of enemies to our salvation, and must be overcome. He who constantly refers every thing in this world to his prospects in the next, and is continually on his guard to detect and resist every feeling and wish which may disincline him from his duty to God, and impair his chance of salvation, who has set all his wishes and habits aright, and avoids even the appearance of evil, may be said to overcome the world. And this great moral victory, the Apostle tells us, is to be achieved by one description of persons, "Whosoever is born of God;" and by means of one instrument or qualification, "Faith in Christ." "Whosoever is born of God overcometh the world: and this is the victory that overcometh the world; even our faith." Since this victory over the world is in fact the achievement of our salvation, as far as our own conduct has any thing to do in that work, it becomes an important article of inquiry to us, Who can properly be said to be born of God? for, it is very plain, that when the Apostle asserts that whosoever is born of God, overcometh the world, he does by implication declare, that whosoever is

not born of God, will not overcome the world. Now the same writer, St. John, speaking of our Saviour, as the Divine Word, in the beginning of his Gospel, says that "he came to his own, (that is, to the Jewish people) and his own received him not: but as many as received him, to them gave he power to become the sons of God, even to them that believe in his name." To them who believed in his name, as the Messiah and only-begotten Son of God, he gave power to be made sons of God by adoption, admitted into his family by regeneration of water and the Holy Spirit; the sons of God, not after the manner of human relationship, not of blood nor of the will of the flesh; but born, in the spiritual sense of a new creation in Christ Jesus, of the mercy and good-will of God.

The natural man, that is to say, every man living who is not a Christian, who wants the gifts and grace of the Gospel, has not strength enough to avoid sin, nor any means of escaping the punishment due to it; he is the child of wrath, born to inherit the just anger of God.

A death unto sin is the being rescued by Christ from the necessity of continuing and dying in sin; this is the first part of the redemption which Christ has wrought for us; the second is the *new birth* unto righteousness; the giving us strength to walk righteously; the capacity of doing things pleasing to God, and of receiving his forgiveness. He, therefore, who enters into the Church of Christ by the appointed form, and with the requisite qualifications, is born unto righteousness, and is made a child of God, as to his capacity of inheriting eternal life, and of receiving that supernatural strength which will enable him to carry all his good desires into effect, and to lead such a life as becometh one who knows that he hath a Father in heaven. This is the completion of the spiritual process which stamps upon the Christian the undoubted marks of relationship to God, and is the peculiar and especial work of the Spirit of adoption, whereby he cries, Abba, Father.

Since the Apostle says that our Saviour gave power to become the children of God to them that believed in his name, and in the text declares, first, that those who are born of God overcome the world; and secondly, that the victory is achieved by faith; it is very evident, that in order to be born of God, and so made his children, the great essential is faith in Jesus Christ. And what is faith in Jesus Christ? What, but a firm and stedfast belief in him, as He is described in the Scriptures of the New Testament, as the promised Redeemer of the world; as the only-begotten Son of the Father; as the Lamb of God, who taketh away the sins of the world; who was crucified as a propitiation for our sins; and rose again in pledge of our justification; and ascended into heaven; and sends his Holy Spirit to sanctify us, and will come at the end of the world to judge us, and to give us the kingdom which he has prepared for us, "that where He is, there we may be also." It is this, and not simply an historical belief that Jesus came into the world to preach a new religion, that he wrought many miracles, and died in attestation of the truth, which deserves the name of faith; or the possession of which will make us sons of God, and enable us to overcome the world. Our faith in Christ must be adequate to the truth, or it will be no faith at all,—and the truth is that which the

Scriptures declare. Their plain and positive words are the proper standard of our faith. We are not to believe just as much as we find easy to understand, or agreeable to our own notions; but just as much as the Scriptures, that is to say, the Holy Spirit, have revealed of the great plan of redemption and of the nature of God. To acknowledge that Jesus Christ was a prophet, is not enough; the Mahometans do that. If he did nothing more than explain the principles of true religion, and die in defence of their truth, he did nothing which would enable mankind to overcome the world, while their natural sinfulness and weakness remained unatoned, and without remedy. But admit that he was the Son of God, and that he offered up himself upon the cross, as an atonement for the sins of the world, and all the motives to godliness become so strong, and the assurances of divine pardon and grace so unquestionable, that we see, as it were, one mightier than us, strengthening us for our conflict with the enemies of our salvation, and putting into our hands the means of resistance and triumph. Justly therefore does the Apostle ask, "Who is he that overcometh the world, but he that believeth that Jesus is the Son of God?"

Before we can attempt to overcome the world, we must be assured that the sinfulness of our nature, our unavoidable deficiencies, our sins of infirmity, will find indulgence and forgiveness with God. If not, of what avail will it be to us, to labour and exert ourselves in doing good works, which cannot of themselves do away or neutralize our evil deeds, nor consequently be any satisfaction for them to the justice of God? And, therefore, unless we have some good grounds for believing that our sins will be forgiven, (which we cannot have, unless we know that some atonement has been made for them,) all our good works will be thrown away. What then, shall we go to Christ? But if *he* be a frail and peccable creature like ourselves, what can he do for us in the way of atonement? Can a creature appease the wrath or satisfy the justice of his and our Almighty Creator? What if he spent his life in doing good? It was no more than he was bound to do; and after all he was an unprofitable servant. If he suffered a cruel death, what effect can that have upon *us*? If he was a mere human person, both his actions and his sufferings terminated in himself; we are no more concerned in them, than in the life and death of any other great and good man. How then can any one, who is convinced that Jesus Christ was a mere man like himself, believe and trust in him for the pardon of his sins, and for reconciliation with God? Thus, then, the very first help towards overcoming the world, which is, the encouraging assurance that our sins of inadvertence will be forgiven, fails us, if we have not a just and adequate faith in the Son of God. Unless we are assured that we may be saved, there is no motive sufficient to animate us in a course of self-denial, and of active laborious virtue; and we *can* have no certainty on that head, unless we know that something has been done to save us; more, infinitely more, than all that we could do ourselves. What has been done we can learn only from the Scriptures: they inform us, that the Son of God took upon him the nature of man, and suffered death upon the cross in our behalf, thereby satisfying the

divine justice, and placing man within the scope of divine mercy. They further inform us, that although Christ has purchased for us eternal salvation by his death, *that* is so far from releasing mankind from the obligations of piety and virtue, that it has unspeakably exalted and strengthened them, and has added an awful, yet an encouraging sanction, to all the duties of religion and morality. They teach us, that although Christ has in himself by his *own* infinite worthiness and power, effected the redemption of mankind from the curse of the law, without reference to *their* doings or deservings; yet that each individual sinner must apply that benefit to himself, by the prescribed method; that man has his work to do, without which he can derive no advantage from all that Christ has done; but that the merits of Christ have procured for him an easy access to the fountain of grace, from which he may draw abundant supplies of spiritual comfort and strength for the performance of his task. Here then are at once the motives and the means to overcome the world. Endued with this faith, the Christian applies himself with earnestness and confidence to obtain that victory over the world, which is both the consequence and the proof of his being indeed the child of God, and of the genuineness of his belief in Jesus Christ. And this brings us to consider somewhat more closely the nature and extent of that conquest, which we are expected to achieve over the world. We shall find, I am afraid, that it comprehends a great deal more than the generality of professing Christians are apt to believe. The first person who used this expression was our Saviour himself. "Be of good cheer, said he to his disciples, I have overcome the world." He overcame the world for them and us, by resisting all its temptations; by dispelling the spiritual darkness which overclouded it; by rescuing mankind from the servile bondage of sin; by disclosing to them the perishable and worthless nature of the things of the world, when put in competition with the kingdom of God and his righteousness; by obtaining for them the promise of grace and strength to resist the Prince of this world, to reject his bribes and to despise his terrors. As Christ, the great Captain of our salvation, obtained this victory over the adversary of the human race, and defeated his general purposes, so each of us, as an individual soldier under *his* banner, must bear his part in the conflict, always fighting under the auspices and sure protection of Christ, but using all his own endeavours to fight the good fight, and to save his soul alive. Our christian course is described by the Apostles as a state of continued warfare; and if we do not find by experience that it is, we have great reason to suspect that our condition is dangerous. That the hindrances to our salvation are strewed thickly in our path, reason and the Scriptures assure us: the Scriptures also assure us, that there is an evil principle actively engaged in presenting to us temptations from without, and fanning into a flame the spark of sinfulness within: and if we can go on quietly from day to day, taking the course of affairs as it may turn up, feeling no disquietude from the struggles of conscience with inclination, no trials of strength between the flesh and the spirit, it is too certain that we are in a state of religious insensibility, the most dangerous state of all to a man's soul. The world is to be overcome; and the world, my brethren, is too

strong to be overcome without a struggle. If we are not sensible of any such struggle, it is not, that the world has not come into conflict with us, but that we have yielded to it at once without resistance. That must indeed be a happy and rare temperament which can enable a man calmly and quietly to pass by all the temptations of the world, and to persevere in a course of self-denying righteousness without a single pang or mental struggle. By far the greater number of cases, where no such inward conflict is felt, are those, where there is no principle of resistance; no faith in Christ; no deliberate choice of religion; no self-examination; no reflection upon consequences; no comparison of the pleasures of sin with its penalties; no seeking for the grace of God; no desire to become his children and servants: cases, in which the persons concerned, far from having overcome the world, have never thought of resisting it; but move on with it, and take its complexion, and find all smooth and agreeable; as the vessel, which is borne along with the stream, when out of sight of the shore, seems to the mariners to be at rest, while in fact it is wafted rapidly along they know not whither.

We are saved by faith in Jesus Christ—but it is by such a faith as enables us to overcome the world. He, therefore, that overcometh not the world, has not a saving faith. No argument can be more conclusive: none ought to be more awakening than this.

You profess the Christian faith: a belief that Jesus is the Son of God. Is it a true faith; a stedfast belief? You ask, how am I to know? We reply, see whether it has induced you to resist, and enabled you to overcome the world. The world persuades you to follow one line of conduct; religion commands you to pursue another;—which do you obey? Sensual pleasure solicits your appetites, the customs of the world sanction the indulgence of them:—the Gospel says, No:—it is inconsistent with your Saviour's precepts. You are a child of God. What is your conduct? Perhaps you have courage to resist, and you feel a natural complacency in the victory, which in this instance you have obtained over a deceitful enemy; but beware of confidence and conceit. You are now assailed in a different way. Worldly pleasure now attempts you under the specious name of amusement. You are told there is no harm in such and such diversions: there is no direct prohibition of them in the Gospel; that you see every body joining in them; that no good results from over strictness; and that, therefore, you may as well add one to the number. On the other hand, religion whispers,—Use this world as though you used it not; beware of contracting a taste for frivolous and unprofitable pleasures, which will give you by degrees a disrelish for higher and purer enjoyments. Take care that you love not the world, neither the things that are in the world, better than the improvement of your own mind and heart. How often do the occasions recur on which these counter representations may be supposed to take place. To which of the two do you attend? Again, God commands you to keep holy the Sabbath day: the practice of the christian church, the law of the land, and the language of sound philosophy, enforce the observance of the precept. The ministers of the Gospel admonish you of its sacredness, and invite you to the public sanctification of the Lord's day. On the other hand, you are

tempted by the customary intermission of business to take a little relaxation as it is called; a ride, or a drive into the country to see your friends; a few morning calls; an hour or two spent over a newspaper or an amusing book; or perhaps to take the opportunity of making up your week's accounts; or clearing arrears of correspondence. And convenience and inclination suggest that there is no great harm in all this. But God says, Sanctify my Sabbaths. Humanity, as well as religion, requires that you should both spare your dependents time to attend to the duties of piety, and set a good example yourself. —Which do you obey?

Once more, my Christian friends; your Saviour says, Do this in remembrance of me. The world neglects that last injunction of its Redeemer, and beckons you away from the Table of the Lord, and tells you that if you refuse his gracious invitations, and reject his proffered means of grace, you will only do as other people do. Which of the two gains your attention? Alas! not your Saviour's; you slight him, whom you profess to believe and honour; and you go with the world, which you promise to overcome and despise. What is such religion? what are its foundations, and its end?—"He that heareth my sayings and doeth them not, the same is like unto a man that without a foundation built an house upon the earth, against which the stream did beat vehemently, and immediately it fell, and great was the fall thereof."

The chief test then, by which we are to determine whether we have in effect overcome the world, is the strict conformity of our conduct to that spirit of piety, and to those rules of holiness, which the world would persuade us to undervalue and neglect.

Wheresoever the least question arises between the strictness of our duty as Christians, and our behaviour as children of this world, there we must sacrifice the world to our duty without hesitation or reserve. Nothing short of this, added to all the duties of practical piety and holiness, and a continued vigilance over the purity of our heart and affections, can justly be entitled, overcoming the world. There is one other sense in which the world is to be overcome by means of faith in Jesus Christ; and that is, when by the strength and efficacy of that faith we are enabled to bear up against all the sorrows and distresses of life, and to take all things patiently, knowing that it is a Christian's lot in the world to have tribulation, but that Christ has overcome the world. It is by faith in him, that we are assured of the forgiveness of our sins, and of the rest which is reserved for the people of God. We know that "as Jesus died and rose again, so also them which sleep in Jesus will God bring with him." Assured that the patient sufferer here is to be the glorious saint hereafter, who will not willingly act the former part for a time, that he may be finally translated into the latter? That it will be so, we have the certificate of an Apostle: "If we suffer with him we shall reign with him."—(Rom. viii. 17.)

Lastly, our victory over the world is not obtained once and for all. The contest is perpetually renewed: although if we once get the better, it will be every successive time more and more to our advantage. But we must never relax in our vigilance, nor think ourselves

secure. The chief cause of men's religious negligence is the too great security of their consciences and love of the world. But it may arise from mistaken views of religion; from an assurance built upon personal feelings, and a partial interpretation of God's word. There is no moment in a man's life, except the last, when he can assure himself that his conquest over the world is final and conclusive.—That he *will* finally and effectually overcome it, he may indeed believe, but it will be by unremitting vigilance and continued seeking for grace. If at any time he considers himself to be in perfect security, he is then in great danger: "for pride ever goeth before a fall." Then, and not till then, shall we indeed have overcome the world, when we are ready to leave it without a pang of regret at the summons of our Lord; when we can behold it fading away from before our eyes without casting one longing lingering look after its vanities; when it will appear as nothing in the contemplation of that glorious prospect which religion unfolds to the faithful Christian; of another world, a glorious and eternal world, the world of spirits and of just men made perfect; where faith shall terminate in knowledge; and those who have believed in Christ and suffered with him, shall see him as he is, and receive the fulfilment of his promise,—“To him that overcometh will I grant to sit with me on my throne; even as I also overcame, and am set down with my Father in *his* throne.”—(Rev. iii. 21.) C.

MISCELLANEOUS.

REMARKS ON THE REVIEW OF MR. HOOK'S CONSECRATION SERMON.

IN entering on a dispassionate discussion of the objections brought forward by the author of the Review of Mr. Hook's Sermon in the *Christian Remembrancer*, for December, 1825, we think it best to commence with the consideration of those circumstances with which the author has brought his objections to Bishop Luscombe's mission to a conclusion; for in this way, we believe, that the question of the expediency of the measure may be brought to issue most easily.

The author of the Review, towards the conclusion of his article, comments most pathetically, on the deserted state of our country-seats, and of the vacant halls and desolated castles of Ireland,—and expresses an earnest hope, which, strange to say, he appears to consider well-founded, “that every Englishman, now in France, will before long be convinced of the propriety of returning to his own country, and diffusing his expenditure among his own countrymen;” and, consequently, the author infers, that as the residence of British subjects in France, will be merely temporary, that their spiritual interests might have been sufficiently attended to by ministers of the Gospel, temporary visitors like themselves.

Had the author of the Review himself visited the continent of late years, or sought for information from those who could have afforded it to him, we think that he must have come to a conclusion widely diffe-

rent from the expectation that every Englishman, now in France, will before long see the propriety of returning to his own country.—On due enquiry, he might have learnt that thousands of our countrymen are now residing on the continent, whose incomes will not permit them to think of returning to England; added to those persons who have established themselves on the continent beyond the possibility of return; many persons of independent fortune prefer Paris and other situations on the continent for their permanent residence, from a variety of motives which it is unnecessary to investigate; and the residence of many others becomes of long and indefinite duration, in consequence of the state of health of one or more individuals of their families rendering a permanent abode in a more genial climate than our own, indispensably necessary; and several thousand British artisans have established themselves in France, none of whom entertain any intention of ever returning to England; it cannot, therefore, be denied, that a *permanent settlement of considerable numbers of our countrymen has taken place on the continent of Europe*; and, as the author distinctly admits that wherever a permanent settlement of Christians was established, there, by the ancient institutions of the Church, a Bishop was appointed, the propriety of Bishop Luscombe's mission may be considered as established by the author's own showing.

We shall, however, proceed to notice all his other objections *seriatim*: in the first, which presents itself at p. 767, the author lays great stress on the circumstance of a Bishop having been sent to Englishmen by the Bishops of Scotland; but the author must have been aware that the British residents on the continent consist of English, Irish and Scotch; it surely was not necessary, or indeed possible, that a Bishop sent to them should have been consecrated by English, Irish and Scotch Bishops; had the consecration taken place, and the mission been sent forth by the English Bishops, a precisely similar objection might have been raised (by those resolved to see difficulties where none really exist) among the Irish and Scotch, as is now urged on the part of the English by the author of the Review; but when churches agree so perfectly in doctrine and discipline, the formal act of one may be safely acquiesced in by the other.

The next objection brought forward is, that no See has been assigned to Bishop Luscombe. In ordinary cases, we imagine that the object in view in confining the ministration of individual Bishops within defined geographical limits, is to prevent the interference of one Bishop with another; and we cannot but think that the limits of Bishop Luscombe's ministration are laid down with sufficient precision for all practical purposes, in his letters of Collocation, by which he is directed "to confine his ministrations on the continent of Europe to British subjects, and other Christians professing themselves to be of a Protestant Episcopal Church." There can be no danger of Bishop Luscombe interfering with other Bishops (there not being any Protestant Bishop either in France or Belgium, to which countries it appears most probable that Bishop Luscombe's ministrations will be confined) except himself; and the author admits that Bishops at large have been consecrated at former periods. And here it may be asked,

whether Irenæus was not a Missionary Bishop sent to France by the Greek Church?

The next objection, urged by the author of the Review, is the apprehension which he entertains "that the world might be disposed to regard a Bishop without external dignity as no Bishop at all." We presume not to know what portion of the great world is filled by the author of the Review; but this we know, that in the portion of the world which we happen to inhabit, that is in Scotland, a Bishop without external dignity is considered in every respect a Bishop. It has come within our knowledge, that a Bishop has walked ten miles on foot to pay a visit at the house of a person of considerable opulence, and notwithstanding he was received with all the deference and respect due to his office; it is also well known that a Prelate, most highly esteemed in this country, set out on his visitation last summer on the outside of a stage-coach; true it is, we grieve that such things should be in this Christian land; but it is, we conceive, a subject of high gratulation, that men can be found to execute all the duties of the Episcopal office with dignity and effect in such circumstances; and that a very large proportion of the well-educated class of society, including individuals of the highest rank of the nobility, are seen most cheerfully and respectfully to observe all the ordinances of the Church, in spiritual subordination to Bishops, who have neither *ecclesiastical courts, lordly titles, or superabundant wealth*, on which they can found any claim to that respect which is much more legitimately paid to the high respectability of their personal character, and to the sanctity of their apostolic office.

We confess that we are not sufficiently long-sighted to perceive any injurious precedents likely to arise from the proceedings which have taken place with reference to Bishop Luscombe's mission. Centuries may elapse before circumstances in any way similar can reasonably be expected to recur; and should similar circumstances ever again exist, we sincerely hope that similar measures will be had recourse to, and that a Bishop will be sent wherever a considerable number of Protestant Episcopalians are to be found. The author of the Review will not, we suspect, feel disposed to controvert the maxim, "*sine Episcopo nulla ecclesia.*"

We now come to what the author is pleased to term "his strongest and most insuperable objection," that he finds "a Bishop," (and as the author fully admits at p. 771, an undoubted Apostolic Bishop) "appointed to the charge of Christian congregations in a country already portioned out in regularly constituted dioceses" of the French Church.

Now if this proves any thing, it proves much more than the author, as we conjecture, would himself wish to prove; for, we believe that the dioceses of England have been portioned out in constituted dioceses of the Roman Catholic Church from the time of the first establishment of the Roman Catholic Church in that country to this very day; and, we believe, it has sometimes happened that the Roman Catholic Bishop and the Protestant Bishop of the same diocese of England have met together in the same society. To this we are aware it may be said, that the Protestant Bishop is BY LAW established

in England, and that the Roman Catholic Bishop is not by law established in that country; and to this distinction we are disposed to pay implicit deference. But how stands this matter in Scotland?

In this country, neither Protestant Bishops nor Roman Catholic Bishops are *by law established*, they are only tolerated; still we see both a Protestant Bishop and a Roman Catholic Bishop perform all the duties of their office in the same city of Edinburgh, without ever coming into collision or contact: one confining his ministrations to Roman Catholics, and the other to Protestants, exactly as we trust will be the case in Paris.

Another example of the co-existence of Protestant and Roman Catholic Bishops in the same country is to be found in Canada; in which country the Roman Catholic Religion is established by positive compact between the people and the state; notwithstanding a Protestant Bishop has been sent to Canada with the concurrence of the English Bishops; and by this measure the English Bishops may be considered as having decidedly expressed their approbation of a Protestant Bishop being located in a district in which a Roman Catholic Bishop is legally established; and further, that the ministration of a Protestant Bishop is not only allowable but expedient in a country, the great bulk of the population of which are Roman Catholics, who are protected in the full exercise of their religious discipline by the capitulation by which their country was surrendered to the Crown of England. We cannot suppose that those high authorities in the Church of England, who have given their sanction to a Protestant Bishop being sent to Catholic Canada, can possibly disapprove of a Protestant Bishop being sent to France,—the circumstances in which British Protestants are placed in both countries being so very similar, and the number of Protestant Episcopalians in France greatly exceeding those in Canada.

We have now touched on all the objections started in the Review before us, except the author's apprehension that "improper persons, without undergoing the previous ordeal of an University education, may obtain holy orders" from Bishop Luscombe; but the author declares, at p. 772, that "if there were any individual whom we should fix upon in preference to another, as a *peculiarly fit and able man* to carry these objects into effect, we could not, perhaps, have named any other before Dr. Luscombe." "And we may be allowed," says the author at p. 771, "to express our cordial satisfaction in the appointment of the individual who has been consecrated by the Scottish Bishops." Such being the sentiments of the author of the Review, we cannot but think he may rely with safety in the prudence of the person of whom he entertained so high an opinion as to have it in his power to fix on no other individual so peculiarly fit and able to perform the duties of the office which has been entrusted to him, in which the power of ordination was necessarily and unavoidably included; the ordeal of an University education is not always insisted on as indispensably necessary in several dioceses of England; and the only real security against the admittance of improper persons to holy orders, is to be found in the prudence and sound discretion of individual Bishops, aided, we trust, by assistance from above.

We will now proceed to comment on those circumstances connected with Bishop Luscombe's mission to the continent, which the author allows to have great weight in support of the measure.

"We cannot," he says, "overlook the want which existed among our countrymen in France of episcopal administration." And "he is not disposed to deny that there is a wide field open for pastoral exertions among our countrymen abroad;" "that many things require to be set in order;" "and much opportunity exists for doing extensive good."

These admissions, from one who is evidently an unwilling evidence to the want which existed of episcopal ministration among our countrymen abroad, and of the good effects which may be reasonably expected to result from the measure adopted to supply this want, are quite sufficient to secure to those persons who have projected that measure, and carried it into successful operation, the cordial approbation of all impartial Christians.

From the advertisement of Mr. Hook's Consecration Sermon, which the author, p. 765, pronounces to be "an ADMIRABLE PRODUCTION," "exhibiting a profound acquaintance with, and reverence for, ecclesiastical antiquity, with no inconsiderable powers of argument and eloquence," the circumstances which led to the consecration of Bishop Luscombe are still more distinctly stated: "that not less than 50,000 of our countrymen, actually resident in France, were exposed to great inconvenience and danger from the absence both of proper teachers, especially licensed and visited, and of the regular administration of the holy sacraments;—the younger members entirely excluded from the rite of confirmation; and to this important want was coupled the evident difficulty of holding a religious society together, without some acknowledged tie and authorized bond of union."

At p. 25 of the Sermon, Mr. Hook states, "that it is a well-known fact, that many thousands of British subjects are, at the present moment, resident abroad. The difference which exists between that branch of the Church to which we belong, and the various Protestant establishments, as well as the Church of Rome, are too striking not to be at once discerned.

"Those absentees from the land of their fathers, therefore, feel a natural dislike to attend, for a continuance, the public worship as established in those countries in which they have taken up their abode; while awful indeed must be the reflection to the pious, that there is none qualified or none willing to administer the sacrament of baptism to the infant, or the eucharist to the sick."

"With the aid of an English Clergyman, if attainable, *their minister is unlicensed, their chapel unconsecrated, and their children uncon-
firmed.*" p. 26.

"Of this holy, apostolical and important rite, the children of many thousands of our brethren not merely travelling over, but ACTUALLY RESIDENT upon the continent, who, being engaged in trade or businesses, ARE LIKELY THERE TO REMAIN, are now deprived. If this then," the preacher goes on to state, "were the sole object to be gained, who would not rejoice at the pious work to which these venerable prelates

are this day about to lay their hands? But we go further: we not only lament the want of order and regularity which result from the spiritual government of a Bishop,—we not only complain of the anomaly of Episcopalians dependent upon no Episcopus,—but we look, with some degree of alarm, to the precedent which is set, of Presbyters establishing, when out of the jurisdiction of their national Bishops, *independent congregations*. Such a procedure, unwarranted by the doctrine, the canons or the example of the primitive church, can only be palliated by extreme necessity—a necessity which it is the present object to remove. The occasional visitation also of a superior—the influence of one coming like a father among his people, especially upon the younger and less experienced Clergy, who are frequently employed in the continental chapels, and who are thus placed in situations where the want of advice and experience is deeply felt; the check, too, which this will have upon those who may be gradually, and almost unawares, yielding to the allurements of dissipation, unchecked by any moral or religious restraints; these are benefits which cannot, ought not to be overlooked.”

“To promote, then, these holy objects, to which we have alluded, and to avert those evils which we so justly apprehend;” “to convince foreigners, particularly Roman Catholics, that ours is the primitive faith, and that, with St. Ignatius, we hold it necessary ‘to have one common prayer, one supplication, one mind, one hope;’ and that, in the words of the same Ignatius, confirmed by the thirty-second of the Apostolical Canons, ‘it is lawful neither to baptize nor to celebrate the holy communion without the Bishop,’—that is to say, without the episcopal sanction,—is the present pious design of our right reverend fathers.”

“Commissioned by these holy fathers, he [Bishop Luscombe] goes to superintend the worship of the British residents abroad; to afford them the means of worshipping God in their own way; to authorize their sacraments; to confirm their children; to license their Clergy; and where many have fixed their abode in one place, without a Clergyman to officiate among them, to ordain some qualified person on the spot.” These are the truly evangelical objects in view; but “unless the Lord keepeth the city, the watchman waketh but in vain.”

The author of the Review of Mr. Hook's Sermon, in conclusion, assures his readers that he hopes to see “the good effects of Bishop Luscombe's ministration abundantly displayed.” In this hope we unite most sincerely; and we believe that an earnest of its fulfilment has been already furnished in the accounts lately transmitted from France. We learn, from the Postscript to Mr. Hook's Sermon, that “Bishop Luscombe has met with a hearty and cordial co-operation among all ranks and orders of British residents in Paris;” in which city he confirmed 120 young persons, on the 23d of June last, being assisted on that solemn occasion by eight Clergymen; and the congregation, both French and English, being as respectable as numerous. And we are most happy to have it in our power to form a correct estimate of the Bishop's reception in the provinces of France, from the following minute of the Confirmation, &c., at St. Servan, drawn up by the resident Minister and Chapel-wardens. The authenticity of this most highly interesting document, of which we subjoin a copy,

may be ascertained, by reference to Messrs. Rivington, from whom the printed copy in our possession was obtained; and its merits will, no doubt, be duly appreciated by all well-wishers to the cause of true religion and holiness.

A LAYMAN, resident at St. Andrews.

A MINUTE OF THE CONFIRMATION, &c.

"It has seemed good to us, the resident Minister and the undersigned Wardens of the English Episcopal Chapel at St. Servan, to record upon our journals an event so singular and interesting, as the visit of the Right Reverend Bishop Luscombe, to hold a Confirmation, which took place on Thursday, the 15th of September, 1825, when nearly seventy persons received the benefit of that rite.

"When we consider our situation, as members of the Church of England, living abroad, and protected in the exercise of our particular form of religion by the tolerant laws of this Christian land, we cannot omit the present occasion to express, in the name and on the behalf of our community, our gratitude to the king and government of France.

"It is true, indeed, we are a Christian community, unconnected with the civil establishment either of our own country, or of that in which we sojourn. The ministry is exercised among us, as being a part of the general Church of Christ, indefinitely dispersed throughout the world; and the Episcopal visitation, which is now no less our duty than our pleasure to record, partakes only of a spiritual nature and jurisdiction. But this occurrence opens to the mind of the intelligent Christian many new and singular considerations. It is an important event in the general history of the Christian Church. It sets forth, that the kingdom and rule of Jesus Christ are not of this world; and that the Christian ministry, which is the visible government of the Church, is purely spiritual. 'Go, and preach the Gospel to every creature,' was the Saviour's command, shewing us, that the diocese of his religion is that of the whole world.

"We view our own Protestant Episcopal Establishment at home as a part of Christ's holy Catholic Church, independent of, though allied to the State; and under this view only can we, who are its members residing abroad, justly consider ourselves as part of its communion; and in the same spiritual light we regard the visitation of Bishop Luscombe.

"Though any State may confer on the body of the Clergy, or its more eminent order, some peculiar honours and immunities, the validity and force of their respective ministrations are ecclesiastically entire without them, and independent of them. They may even possess an advantage which may counterbalance state distinctions; namely, a character more primitive and apostolic. The diocese of the first Bishops was not contained in any local compass, in the opinion of Usher, Hooker, and other indisputable friends of the English Church. Temporal distinctions and canonical regulations may be superadded, extended, or curtailed, and altogether laid aside, without invading or affecting that which is purely evangelical.

"The simple form of church government by deacons, presbyters,

and bishops, may become established and guaranteed by acts of the State, or be separated from it, and yet not lose its ecclesiastical character and powers. Our own excellent Church is a proof of this. At home she enjoys the sunshine of political prosperity. We ourselves are an instance where she is separated from the State, and exists simply on the model of the primitive ages:—an incontrovertible proof that the Church of England does not want a spiritual character, and a catholicity, which has been sometimes denied; that she is not confined to the narrow limits of the sea-girt isle; or exists only by the arm of secular power.

“The reason which we assign for thus stating at length this point, is, if it be necessary, to exculpate us, who are a professed Church of England society, uniting sometimes in our service, by its catholic spirit, those even who at home may follow some peculiar persuasion, and at this juncture more especially, for receiving in an ecclesiastical and spiritual capacity one of the chief pastors of the Church. We do it also to obviate any scruple which might arise; to inform those of our countrymen who might not have reflected on the spiritual nature of Christ's church in the world; and because this minute necessarily establishes a precedent of Episcopal jurisdiction in and over our particular community; and because the office of Episcopacy, which at home is connected with the State, might seem to require this explanation. A moment's reflection, indeed, shows, that as inferior ministers serve in a spiritual manner, and the resident one here exercises the Presbyterian function, so in the same way we receive the Episcopal ministration; a coincidence striking and gratifying.

“The advantages of a superiority, spiritually exercised in the Church, is obvious, on the grounds and reason of all government. Those which concern us and the other English churches scattered abroad, are apparent from the following considerations:—their number and increasing importance; the many persons born, or chiefly educated, without the possibility of receiving many of the ordinances of their religion, and especially the rite of confirmation; the interest and mutual concern thereby excited among the members of the same communion, dispersed through the continent of Europe; the increased security which is given against the intrusion of unworthy ministers, and the encouragement that is afforded to the rightly-called and faithful minister; the respectability which results to the community in general, in the eyes of others, and the stimulus which is given ‘to hold fast the form of sound words,’ which the good and pious of former ages have by the noblest means obtained and bequeathed to us. Besides these advantages, by the juxta-position in which different parts of the Christian Church are placed, the real discrepancies from truth may be discerned, prejudices and false impressions removed, the surmising amongst false brethren silenced, and charity and good-will enlarged.

“Nor are we without authority from the sacred volume, which is left us as well to teach the government as the doctrines of Christ's church. We read therein of the visitation which St. Paul made, when he went into Syria and Cilicia, confirming the churches, the brethren of his own native province. And he said unto Barnabas, ‘Let us go where the word of the Lord is preached, and see how our brethren do.’ He wished to visit these newly-formed communities, that he might

nurture them in true religion, supply their defects, impart unto them spiritual gifts, and confirm the young converts in their faith.

"Such oversight now belongs to the superior ministers of the Church, and is necessary, since every infant church especially needs parental nurture; and in all ages, since the days of the Apostles, the two chief means have been confirmation and episcopal inspection. The universal and invisible Church, which is not of this world, is founded on the immutable Rock of Truth; is built up by the Spirit, and remains for ever: but the church militant on earth may suffer through neglect, or an insufficient ministry; or may be strengthened and enlarged by the care and vigilance of its governors. In the Church itself a superiority is lodged in some, whose duty it is to be overseers of the Clergy, as they are of the laity; and to set in order all things that be wanting, according to the example of the great Apostle of the Gentiles, who left his beloved brother Titus in Crete, commissioned to superintend the concerns of those newly-planted churches.

"Our own circumstances seem to bear some resemblance to this state of the primitive Church; and we cannot but, as in duty bound, beg the Divine blessing on the labours of him who has undertaken the mission of an Evangelist, that it may be 'for the perfecting of the saints for the work of the ministry, and for the edifying of the body of Christ.' We rejoice also that the Spirit of the Lord God has awakened the Christian compassion of our brethren in Scotland, to send forth their missionary Bishop to visit us. May blessings be multiplied on the Church of Great Britain and Ireland, and especially on him who comes, and they who receive, a prophet in the name of a prophet. May glory result to God, and much reward to man. May the sheep of Christ, 'dispersed on the dark mountains of this naughty world,' be collected together in one faith, and be fed in one fold, under one Shepherd, Jesus Christ the Lord. May the Gospel be purely preached, the sacraments duly administered, the ordinances and discipline of the Church observed, morality and true piety revive and flourish, until all mankind be saved, and earth be made the nursery for heaven.

"Thus have we, the undersigned, executed a duty and a pleasure in recording this first visitation of the Right Reverend Bishop Luscombe, so considerably sent by the Church at home, to inspect the state, and enhance the welfare, of her sons abroad; and as a small testimony of our grateful sense of the kindness shown us, and of the benefit which the junior members of our families have received in the rite of Confirmation, we, the undersigned resident Minister and Chapel-wardens, do enrol this minute for ourselves and the English community, as a record of the past; and do forward it to the Right Reverend Prelate, as a small testimony of their views and feelings, and of the very general satisfaction which was given by his visit and by his highly-esteemed exhortation."

(Signed by)

SHOVEL BRERETON, M.A. *Minister.*

CAPTAIN GRANT,

CAPTAIN DENT,

LIEUT. CHAPMAN,

DR. NEWTON,

} *Wardens.*

BISHOP LUSCOMBE'S MISSION.

To the Editor of the Christian Remembrancer.

SIR,—Without any intention or desire of discussing the merits of Bishop Luscombe's Mission, I cannot permit the observations of "Simplex," in your last number, to pass unnoticed, since it appears to me that he has argued not only upon a mistaken view of the subject, but upon an erroneous principle. The error into which he appears to have fallen is this,—that he considers the Church of England merely as a *sect*, instead of what it really is, and has been triumphantly proved to be, by the best and wisest of our divines, a branch of the Catholic Church. Let Simplex view the Church in this light, and the chief of his objections will vanish. For of the Catholic Church it has been the invariable tenet, long before the days of Cyprian, that the Episcopate is one,* and, consequently, that a member of that Church owes allegiance not merely to the prelates of the country in which he was born, but to the duly consecrated bishop of the place in which he may chance to reside. With that bishop he is bound to communicate, notwithstanding any difference that may exist between the rites and ceremonies of that foreign Church, and those of his native land, except where, as in the case of Greece and Rome, they have degenerated into heretical and idolatrous superstitions; for there, as it was ruled by Cyprian, and thirty-six other prelates, in the case of the Spanish bishops, Martialis and Basilides, the Clergy and people are not only authorized, but in duty bounden to renounce their allegiance,—and the orthodox bishops of a neighbouring nation, acting not in their ordinary, but their Catholic character, are permitted to send one of their number to preside over those who may continue in the primitive faith.† But in those things, as St. Austin says, "*De quibus nihil certi statuit Scriptura divina, mos populi Dei, vel instituta majorem pro lege tenenda sunt.*" This was the ancient principle, and this is the principle upon which the soundest of our divines continue to act; it was on this principle that the great Bishop Horsley advised those

* "The Episcopate, St. Cyprian tells us, is single, and there is but one, of which, however, *each bishop* holds his part, with the privilege and *duty of being interested in the whole.*" I quote this to let Simplex see by what *right* the Scottish bishops acted on the late occasion.

† The supporters of bishop Luscombe's mission have been called upon to adduce a precedent for the measure that has been adopted by the church in Scotland. That the learned bishops in Scotland have not acted without sufficient warranty from antiquity, all who are acquainted with the history of their venerable church must be convinced. But, in order to shew that, in an extraordinary case, bishops may be permitted to transgress a general rule, I will cite, in addition to what is said above, the example of the famous Eusebius, of Samosata, who, as Theodoret (Lib. iv. cap. 13.) informs us, went about the world in a soldier's habit to ordain presbyters and deacons, in the heat of the Arian persecution: for which action he was never, that I have heard of, visited with the censures of the church, although, as Bingham observes, he committed a breach of two laws, one against the wearing of armour, the other, against ordaining in another's diocese,—the necessity of the times being sufficient excuse.

clergymen who happened to be resident in Scotland, not only to pay allegiance to the Scottish bishops (for in this he was seconded by all the members of the English bench who were applied to, some of whom are still in existence), but to receive the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper according to the form adopted by their communion,—and it is upon the same principle that one of the most learned of the prelates of Ireland, whose name I am not at liberty to mention, has, at a later period, tendered the same advice.

Now, if the Church of England were merely a sect; then, indeed, it would be necessary for the English abroad, on all occasions, to apply for sanction to the authorities at home. But being, in fact, when once they have quitted the shores of England, members of the Church at large, their allegiance becomes due, not, as I said before, to an English diocesan, but to the Ordinary of the place wherein they reside; if in Scotland, to the Scottish bishops, if in America, to the American bishops, &c. When, however, they are resident on the continent of Europe, there are few places where there is an authority established which they can conscientiously acknowledge; for as Theodoret observes, “Where Christians are given to the worship of angels”—*à fortiori* of saints and idols, as the papists are—“they have left the Lord Jesus Christ.” They must, therefore, in this case, apply to proper ecclesiastical authority for the appointment of an Ordinary qualified for the discharge of the episcopal functions. The question, then, is,—In whom is that authority vested? Simplex would answer, that they could only lawfully apply to the bishops of England;—whereas I contend, that although, as an Englishman, I should prefer making application to those excellent and exemplary prelates who preside over our national Church,—yet this is by no means a necessary, and, in some cases, may be an inexpedient course. Suppose, for instance, I were resident in a town in France, in which there were also resident several Scottish and several American Episcopalians;—Simplex, if not an Erastian, will allow that we should be of the same communion, and that if any one of us should refuse to hold communion with the others, we should be schismatics: Suppose, also, an American clergyman were to come to reside among us for the purpose of performing divine service, and that, convinced of the irregularities arising from the want of an Ordinary, and desirous of securing the rite of confirmation for our children, we should determine to apply in the proper quarter for the redress of the grievance: while the Englishman would contend that application should be made to the English Bench, and the Scotchman would plead for the Episcopal College in Scotland, the American would think it necessary to uphold the dignity of the prelates of the United States. Each party would, in this instance, be acting on the narrow principles of a sect, and Catholic unity would be thus destroyed. But, sinking all national distinctions, they would, if they acted properly, and as really Catholic Christians, come to the determination of applying to any lawful authority capable of judging of the expediency or inexpediency of granting their petition and relieving their wants. Referring to the records of the Church in its primitive and purest ages, they would find that the Christians in those days, when they were in want of a bishop, did not think it necessary to apply to any particular Church,—to the

Church of Alexandria, or the Church of Rome, or the Church of England,—but to a synod of the neighbouring bishops canonically convened. A synod of bishops, then,—not merely of the bishops of England,—but *any canonical assembly of orthodox bishops*,—is the proper authority for the appointment of a prelate to preside over those to whom none has hitherto been appointed.* “Where there is authority to appoint, there is duty to obey.” And to an Ordinary, therefore, thus appointed, it becomes the duty of Episcopalians to give their allegiance. This is the answer to the great objection which Simplex makes at starting to the appointment of “a continental bishop.” If the English Clergy resident in France are Episcopalians, they will act on the orthodox and Catholic principles which true Episcopalians have always maintained, and render their allegiance to Bishop Luscombe; if they are *not* Episcopalians,—why then no harm is done; they will, of course, withhold their allegiance, and things will remain, as far as *they* are concerned, as they were before; for I feel sure that Bishop Luscombe can have no wish to violate the rule of St. Jerome; “Episcopus præest volentibus, non nolentibus.”

Simplex appears to me to be, throughout, entirely mistaken in supposing that the Scottish bishops presumed to send Bishop Luscombe to preside over any little sect of Englishmen on the continent; they, as Episcopalians, have sent him to superintend, not merely the English, but all those Episcopalian communions in France and the Netherlands, of whatsoever nation or language, who, although professing Episcopalian principles, have not any person among them, qualified to discharge the Episcopal functions. Already, a communion of French Protestants, whose minister has received Episcopal ordination, and who have adopted the authorized translation of our Liturgy, have tendered their allegiance to Bishop Luscombe, being actuated, not by sectarian, but by truly Catholic principles.

It is against the general principle upon which Simplex argues, which goes, in my opinion, to *unchurch* the English establishment, that I contend; I forbear, therefore, to descend to particulars and details. They were wise men and good who decided upon the mission of Bishop Luscombe, and they need not the advocacy of so humble an individual as myself. But, if need shall be, I think that Simplex will find that the Cyprianic mantle of Sage has not fallen upon unworthy shoulders; and that if a Jolly and a Low, a Sandford and a Gleig, have acted with decision and firmness, they can also defend their conduct with learning and talent.

I remain, Sir,

Your obedient humble servant,

W. F. H.

April 5th, 1826.

* Simplex would imply, that some English bishop is the Ordinary of all the English abroad,—I wish to know by what *ecclesiastical* authority he has been appointed. He also quotes an act of the British parliament;—I wish to know whether the laws of England are binding on those who *reside* on the continent.

ON THE EXPEDIENCY OF HOLDING PUBLIC MEETINGS ON BEHALF OF CHURCH SOCIETIES.

To the Editor of the Christian Remembrancer.

SIR,—I beg leave to send you a few observations on "A Letter to the Lord Archbishop of Canterbury, President of the Societies for Promoting Christian Knowledge, and for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts, on the present State of those Societies, and on the Benefits which might accrue to them from holding Public Meetings in their behalf. By a Layman."

The Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, and that for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts, have long existed in so intimate a connexion with the Church in which they originated, as to have acquired much of the same fixed and established character. With the advantages, they, however, also partake of the disadvantages to which all institutions, formed in times very different from our's, are subject, by the changes which have taken place in public opinion, and the general spirit of the age. New societies have arisen in our own days of a very different character in some respects, though professing to have similar objects in view. These modern associations have had the great advantage of being able to profit by the experience of those which preceded them, and of constituting themselves altogether in the manner most likely to further their views. We have now before us the results of their labours, and an opinion may be fairly formed as to the wisdom of the plans of their founders. That they have been successful in obtaining notoriety and subscriptions cannot be doubted, whatsoever opinion may be entertained as to the real good effected by them. The author of the letter imputes this success to the Public Meetings which are one characteristic of them—and urges the expediency, if not the necessity, of adopting a similar course with respect to the Societies for Promoting Christian Knowledge, and for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts.

"In them (*i. e.* public meetings) the preservation of the shipwrecked mariner; the instruction of the unenlightened heathen; the conversion of the Jews; the abolition of slavery; the advancement of education;—and many other objects, equally philanthropic, are discussed and advocated with zeal, if not always with discretion. Although some of the objects may not be pursued by the most legitimate courses; although, in these discussions, zeal may sometimes degenerate into intemperance, and fanaticism may be substituted for piety; yet still, my Lord, it is a cheering and heart-stirring sight, to behold a crowded and attentive meeting, listening to details which do not affect their worldly interests, and anxiously watching over the concerns of those with whom they have no immediate connexion." Pp. 2, 3.

This is taking the most favourable view of the subject for his own cause,—but not one calculated to give a correct idea of it in all its bearings. In the following passage, the advantages are more detailed.

"The advantages derived from public meetings, both to their respective objects and to the persons who attend them, are undoubtedly

great. Information respecting their proposed object is widely circulated, and that too, in a way which renders it much more attractive than when embodied in a report. There are many, induced perhaps by novelty, or some other trifling motive, to be present at these meetings, whose attention it would be difficult to attract by means of a formal statement; moreover, the account in the public journals of the proceedings, is read by multitudes to whom the cause would be otherwise wholly unknown. Nor is the knowledge only of the hearers increased; their affections are more easily excited by an oral address than by the best written report." p. 4.

Upon this the Layman proceeds to enlarge at some length, but finally sums up the advantages very briefly.

"The great advantages accruing to a cause, from periodical meetings, are, without doubt, the notoriety given to it, and the interest excited in its favour." p. 9.

This is followed by a statement of the want of notoriety and general interest in the two societies in question, and the remainder of the letter is employed in the attempt to enforce from these premises, a conclusion in favour of the adoption of public meetings by the societies, whose cause he advocates.

Such is the substance of the pamphlet, which has been given at once and in the words of the author, that its intrinsic worth may be better estimated. Upon some of the assertions and arguments contained in it, I will now make a few observations.

In the first place, I conceive that the success of the societies which have availed themselves of public meetings to the extent now common, is by no means to be ascribed in so great a degree to such meetings as the Layman would infer. Many other causes have contributed to their success in an equal and even a greater degree. The complicated machinery by which such effects have been produced, was not the result of a public meeting, nor have public meetings ever been the really effective force. They have had their use, but would have been a mere idle parade, had not the minds of the auditors been prepared beforehand, and the feelings, once excited, never been left to cool afterwards.

That *information* may be rapidly communicated, and with greater effect by public meetings, is in some cases true; but surely the Layman does not imagine that *information* is the great object of those who compose the bulk of such assemblies. The report is almost invariably made a mere plea for speechifying. The plain matter of fact is lost in the quantity of words to which it gives rise, and very rarely is any more definite idea conveyed than that something very great is to be effected by means of these societies, and that all present ought to contribute to the utmost of their power.

There are, no doubt, some advantages to be obtained from public meetings, which cannot be so fully secured in any other way; but the question is not to be decided in their favour with respect to the Societies for Promoting Christian Knowledge and for propagating the Gospel, so rapidly and on so partial a view as the Layman thinks sufficient. Meetings of this nature may be very well adapted for the attainment of the objects of those societies which have hitherto made

use of them, and may be peculiarly calculated to meet the views and feelings of those classes of persons inclined to support them, and yet would prove very awkward appendages to the elder societies, and be very little suited to the habits of regular churchmen. If it be said that the habits of the latter then must be changed, and the constitution of the societies altered so as to receive this addition, it may deserve serious consideration, whether the gain would be so great as to deserve the incurring the risk attendant on such a change. It is easy to draw a pleasing picture of our prelates presiding, and our ablest divines assisting at such meetings;—nor am I insensible to the decided superiority public meetings, well regulated under such circumstances, would have over those which now occupy attention; but if the object be to gain popular feeling, the Established Church can never stand in such assemblies on equally advantageous ground with those now existing; and, I apprehend, failure in this respect would be far more prejudicial than any evils at present experienced. Learning, moderation, and sober piety are not the things calculated to make such meetings attractive to the many. There is a kind of decent and becoming restraint in the Church, owing to the very nature of its constitution, which would effectually check those bursts of enthusiasm which contribute principally to the success of public meetings. If meetings of this kind were now adopted by the societies in question, it must be evident, from their close connexion with the highest authorities in the Church, that they must be modified in some measure, so as to suit its general character. As the matter now stands, it appears in the power of the bishops and leading men in the various dioceses, to give that additional degree of publicity which local circumstances may render necessary; but if it be made an essential characteristic of the societies that such meetings *must* be held, it will be found, perhaps, neither so easy nor so advantageous as the author of the Letter imagines.

With regard to the great advantages "*notoriety*" and "*interest*," I am persuaded they can be obtained to a sufficient degree by the exertions of the Clergy in their respective parishes; and without their exertions, even the author of the Letter admits that public meetings will be in vain.

"But while I urge the necessity of holding public meetings, that the Societies for Promoting Christian Knowledge, and for the Propagation of the Gospel, may be fully understood, and properly supported by the members of the Established Church, I must not omit to mention that which alone can render such meetings effectual, the exertions of the parochial Clergy."—p. 19. "I repeat that it is only by the *personal exertions* of the Clergy that the people can be effectually roused." p. 21.

But if this be true, would it not be the safer course, to try fully in the first instance what can be effected by the personal exertions and influence of the Clergy, before we resort to a plan which has certain evils, but uncertain advantages?

I am, Sir, your obedient servant,

April, 1826.

A. B.

TITHE OF MILLS.

A CORRESPONDENT, signing himself a Norfolk Clergyman, has sent us a copy of the judgment of the Court of Exchequer, in a cause which the Rev. Dr. Browne, of Gorleston, in the county of Suffolk, and diocese of Norwich, instituted for the Tithe of Mills, and wishes us to give an opinion whether it be advisable to make an attempt to set aside the judgment of the Court of Exchequer, by appealing to the House of Lords.

We insert the judgment, and presume to offer some remarks upon it.

Tuesday, 7th February, 1826.

(BROWNE, D. D. v. WOOLLSEY AND OTHERS.)

Lord Chief Baron.—"The bill is brought against the several defendants, for an account of the tithes of mills in their several occupations. Not any of the mills are ancient. All the defendants say that they do not grind for hire in the usual way, but that they are Corn and Grain Merchants; that they buy the corn and grain, grind it, and then sell the flour in its manufactured state; and they insist that for this operation no tithe is payable.

"There have been many cases respecting the tithes of mills. It seems now settled that they are personal tithes; but that for one purpose they are prædial. They belong to the incumbent of the parish where the mill is situated—so far they are prædial. They are payable only at Easter; and the clear gains alone are titheable after deducting all expences—so far they are personal.

"The general question here is, whether tithes should be rendered where a mill is not as hitherto it has usually been, by itself a substantive undertaking, where the sole profit is derived from the act of grinding, but where it is employed as part of a trade or commerce; I am of opinion, and I speak my own sentiments only, that under these circumstances no tithe is to be paid in respect of the employment of this engine in the trade.

"It is quite clear that the incumbent is not entitled to participate, in any shape, in the profits of a trade or manufacture. It is equally clear, on the other side, that, if the mill is employed in the usual way, and the miller is paid for the grist or mulcture, the incumbent is entitled to an aliquot part of what he receives, after deducting the expences. It has appeared to me that what I have had to consider in this case is, under which of these descriptions this case is to be classed. I think that it is under the first—It is a trade.

"It appears to me to be decisive against tithes being due, that there is no possible medium by which it can be ascertained how much is due upon the common principles of tithe. The occupier buys the grain and he sells the flour; how much profit or how much loss remains to him upon the whole is what he only knows. In one transaction there may be some loss, and in the next a great gain: on the whole there may be a profit; or there may be, upon the whole, a loss. This arises from the change in the market-price of the commodity. Suppose that upon one purchase he loses—Is any tithe to be paid in that case? Suppose that upon the next he derive a double profit—Is double tithe to be paid for it? When he loses, it is clear that he receives nothing for grinding. When he gains, who can say how much is to be considered as received for the grist?

"I beg that it may be always remembered, that tithe, in its nature, is an aliquot part of some increase or profit received—a part of the thing itself. I must admit that an occupation-rent might be set on the mill, and a proportion of that rent might be paid to the incumbent; but then I say that tithe is, in its nature, an aliquot part of an actual increase, or actual profit. Now, supposing that there were an occupation-rent set on a mill, the party paying a proportion of that rent would be paying an assessment in lieu of tithe—not tithe—not an aliquot part of any increase or profit obtained for grinding.

"I am the less reluctant to adopt this reasoning, because the point appears to me to have been actually laid down, by great authority, in the case of *Wilson v. Mason*, reported in the second of *Gwillim*. It appeared there, that the defendant ground his corn for the purpose of distillation, and of feeding hogs with the refuse; and upon the ground which I have stated, the mill in that case was held not to be titheable. The principle is stated by Lord Chief Baron Parker in these words—'Now the profits arising from the distillation and feeding of hogs, are so intermixed with the grist or mulcture of the corn, that we do not see by what medium they can be separated, or how we can distinguish the quantum of the plaintiff's satisfaction for the grist or mulcture, from the profits of the trade, which he ought to have no share of, upon his present demand of tithe of a mill.' Now *that* principle is in my judgment directly applicable to this case; and there is too much good sense in it to leave me to doubt whether that could be questioned. There are, however, in *Wilson v. Mason*, some loose phrases, from which it might be inferred, that if the flour or meal had been sold and not used it might have been titheable. But I think that the principle I have read from the book, goes the full length of deciding that where nothing is paid specifically for the grist or mulcture, nor any profit obtained but what depends entirely upon other circumstances, it becomes impossible to make the separation essential to this claim.

"It is said, that by making use of his mill in this way, the miller deprives the incumbent of his tithe, but so it is with every species of tithe. The occupier may use the land in such a way as to give the benefit of it to the owner of the great tithes, or to the owner of the small tithes, or, if he pleases (of which we have heard, as an anecdote, a remarkable instance) he may let his land go to waste—he is not bound to produce any tithes: that pervades the whole nature of tithes; he may cultivate *that* produce which pays a small and insignificant modus, or *that* which is titheable. The tithe-owner must take his chance.

"Upon the best consideration I can give this case, it appears to me impossible to divide these two things, except by an act which is not tithing, but making an assessment in lieu of a tithing. I therefore think that this bill must be dismissed."

Mr. Baron Graham.—"I have to express my regret at feeling obliged to say, that I am of a different opinion from the learned Lord Chief Baron, and I rather apprehend, from the opinion of my two learned brothers. The circumstances of the case are extremely plain and clear. Here is a mill liable to tithe, and must have been so from the time of its first erection, which was long after the statute of Edward the Sixth, and the ground on which this temporary exemption is claimed on the part of the defendants, is, that instead of grinding at the mill the corn of other persons, he purchases the corn himself, converts it into meal, and makes his profit not by the grinding of the corn merely, but by the selling of the meal.

"Now the case of *Wilson v. Mason*, to my apprehension, is perfectly and essentially different from this: *There* the subject before the court was not a *mill*. I know that Lord Chief Baron Parker says that he had the character both of a miller and of a distiller; but he was essentially a distiller: and that seems to me to mark the difference in the first instance. Then what is the trade of a distiller? A mill is erected for no purpose of grinding corn for the general profit of man, or for the food of man, which are, according to my apprehension, the two objects of the grinding, where the tithe is given to the parson. What are the circumstances of that case? Those gentlemen (call them millers, if you please, but they were distillers) had erected a mill for the purpose of grinding meal, not for the purpose of human food, but for the purpose of grinding it as one step, and one advance, in the progress of their manufacture—not to use it in the shape of meal, or of food, but for the purpose of distillation. When it was ground, whether it was wheat, or rye, or barley, for the purpose of distillation, while it was in that state, it was not intended to be used, but it was to be placed in the

still, and to undergo a variety of processes, and they were to derive their ultimate profit, not from the meal, but from the result of the manufacture. That was a complicated case in many of its circumstances, and, to be sure, the court might say, very clearly, that such a case as that is not within the object of the statute which gives this particular tithe of mills, because the corn ground in that mill was not used for human food, but was merely subservient to the great purposes of the manufacture, which was that of distillation: and then, to be sure, the maxim applies that you will not break into the private concerns of a man's trade; you will not oblige him to discover his affairs, in order to know what would be the ultimate profit resulting from his manufacture.

"But it appears to me that the case which presents itself before us is perfectly different, because, what manufacture is there, in the present instance, *anterior* to the grinding? There is none upon earth; when the corn is ground, the manufacture is perfectly finished; therefore it appears to me it is extremely easy to separate and distinguish the profit made by the miller by grinding in such a case as this, for when it is ground it is fit for sale—there is nothing *anterior* to be done, there is no further use to be made of it in the way of manufacture.

"There is another circumstance in the case of *Wilson v. Mason*, that I wish to mention. It appears, that part of the mash of the mill was given to the hogs at the distillery, and, in some instances, corn was ground for the purpose of feeding the hogs; but I consider that the feeding of hogs is part of the trade of a distillery. They apply the mash, and occasionally grind corn, for the purpose of feeding hogs: but that was not within the scope and the object of the original intention of tithing mills.

"Then I say that upon the grinding here, the whole manufacture ceases—the whole operation is done—and the question is, shall it be said that a miller, or shall twenty millers in the same parish (as we know in many parishes in England there are great numbers of millers, the tithes of the mills constituting the principal part of the provision of the parson of the parish)—shall it be said, or does not it lead to the consequence of such a thing being done, that every miller would convert himself immediately into a meal-man—and how is it possible for the rector of the parish to know whether a miller grinds his own corn, or the corn of other people? Therefore it is that I venture to give my opinion, and my reasons for it; perhaps they are too crude, but I confess that I have not considered the subject so deeply as I ought to have done, when I began to feel the extreme importance. For see how exceedingly easy it would be to avoid the payment of tithes on these mills; the implication is perfectly clear; it is so strong, that in no instance, it is probable, would those mills continue to be titheable, because it would be perfectly easy for the miller to say to the great growers of corn, 'Do not sell all your corn at market, I will buy your corn;' and to the buyers he would say, 'Buy your meal of me, I can sell you meal cheaper than any body else, because, by being a meal-man, I pay no tithe at all, and consequently exact a less price for my meal. By being a meal-man, I can, in the improved state of my manufacture, which is meal grinding, use the one-tenth part, which if I was not a meal-man, the vicar or the rector would be entitled to: I sell the tenths of the grinding with the commodity itself, and by that means absorb the whole of the rector's tithes, and turn it to my own advantage and profit'—I think that would be pregnant with a great many difficulties.

"But it is said that there is a difficulty in this case, in separating the accounts. I will not take up the words of the learned judges who gave their opinions in the case of *Wilson v. Mason*; but if one were to look at their language, it would appear that they speak of the difficulty of distinguishing the clear profit of the mill from the ultimate profit which is made by the different processes of the manufacture, in the case of a distillery: but, I say, I will not dwell upon that, but I cannot conceive the existence of any great difficulty in coming at the clear profits the man makes by the mill, upon the present occasion. It is said

that there is a difficulty in ascertaining what are the profits he ultimately gets by converting it into meal. In the first place, if he finds it for his advantage to convert it into meal, it is only saleable in the shape of meal; no miller sells his corn as such, but he sells it in the shape of meal. I do not perceive that there is any kind of difficulty in ascertaining the amount of what the vicar is entitled to. He has only to say to the miller, 'How many quarters of wheat have you ground at such a particular time?' Then, when the question of how many quarters of wheat he has ground is ascertained, he may ask him, 'Can you tell me what is the price of grinding? you pay no price—you grind for yourself—but you know perfectly well what the price is.' If he will not say what the price is, the vicar may prove what the price of grinding is. Then, if you have such a quantity of corn ground, and know what the price of grinding is, that it is which the vicar is entitled to. But it is said, that very likely, when he has ground that flour, he cannot tell whether he has or has not made a profit of his flour. If that was the case, I see no reason why he should not say, 'with respect to what profit I make of it, in the course of my trade, you have no right to put that question to me.' Let him make that objection when he pleases with respect to his own discovery, but surely it is perfectly competent for the vicar, in such a case as that, when he has once fixed what the price of the grinding is, to go on to say, I know that, during such a time, or during so many months, you sold your meal at a profit—you sold without complaint, and you sold in circumstances of credit—you made therefore a general profit of it, and I fix the particular profit that I am entitled to arising from the grinding.

"Upon these grounds, therefore, I cannot help thinking, that this is a case of very considerable importance in itself, and of very extensive consequences, and a case upon which I conceive myself to be perfectly grounded in saying, that there is not that kind of difficulty that there is in an ulterior state of manufacture. The mere conversion of the corn into meal, constitutes all that is done; and it appears to me that the accidental circumstance of the person uniting the two characters together of miller and meal-man does not exempt him from the payment of the tithe upon the grinding of corn. It is quite clear that this tithe cannot be separated, at the time of the grinding, from the general expence of the mill; it is quite clear that the operation of the mill, that is, the grinding, being in this particular parish, the rector or vicar at this instant would be entitled to the tithes upon it, if there was not this difficulty opposed to him as to the impossibility of separating the account of that which he is entitled to: that does not appear to me to be such as supports my learned brother's judgment. Upon these grounds, therefore, I am of opinion, that the bill ought to be sustained."

Mr. Baron Garrow and Mr. Baron Hullock — Concurred with the Lord Chief Baron in opinion that the bill could not be sustained.

Dr. Browne's counsel, who, we believe, is of great eminence in his profession, says, in an opinion with which we have been furnished, "I think the decision wrong, and that this is a very fit case for an appeal to the House of Lords. How far the tithes of these mills may be worth the expence and risk of such a proceeding, is for the plaintiff to determine."

Although exceedingly desirous that a clergyman should at all times have his just rights, we cannot but accede to the principle of this decision in its fullest extent. Tithe of mills is clearly a *personal* tithe.

One-tenth part of Farmer Clodpole's wheat, on being severed from the ground, becomes the rector's property; and if the farmer carry the other ninth-tenths to the mill, and the miller take one of those tenths for grinding, the rector becomes entitled to one-tenth part of the miller's one-tenth; or, in other words, the clergyman is entitled to

every tenth toll-dish, which was the ancient and original mode of paying tithe for a corn-mill. Now this one-tenth of the miller's tenth, is clearly paid, as being one-tenth of the *produce* of the miller's *personal* labour by means of his mill; but as he rendered his tithe in kind, it was thought by some to be a prædial tithe. Were such the case, it would be a gross anomaly in the payment of tithes. *Corn* would render *double dues* to the Church. First a *tenth* in the *sheaf*,—and secondly, a *hundredth part* in the shape of *meal*. Now, unless the miller's labour was *productive*, he rendered no tithe; the toll-dishes were at once the measure of his labour, and the measure of his gains. His labour could not cause him a loss, for he had neither buying nor selling. His toll-dish was certain. The more he ground, the more were his gains, and the greater his tithe. As soon as the miller becomes a meal-merchant, there are no means of ascertaining what gains are produced by his labour as a grinder of corn, for this labour is mixed with other labour; he has not merely the additional *personal* labour of buying the corn, and of selling and delivering the meal to his customers, but he has also to exert his *skill and judgment* as a *merchant*, and to risk his *capital*;—his mill is auxiliary to his trade;—that trade is his means of making a livelihood—and his livelihood is now no longer certain; he has no toll-dishes. Suppose he should *fail* either for want of skill or judgment, or by reason of the insolvency of his customers; would it not be absurd to say, that he nevertheless had made great gains as a miller—that his *labour* as a *grinder of corn* had been very *productive*,—and that 100*l.* a year was the tithe of it; but that his trade as a *meal-merchant* had been his ruin? When the aggregate of the labour employed is *unproductive*, is it consistent with justice to separate it into parts, and to tax one of its parts as *productive*?

Mr. Baron Graham's argument is, we think, at variance with itself. His words are,—“I do not perceive that there is any kind of difficulty in ascertaining the amount of what the vicar is entitled to. He has only to say to the miller, How many quarters of wheat have you ground at such a particular time?”—The price of grinding is then to be ascertained, and one-tenth of that price the learned Baron declares to be the vicar's due—the *vicar's due at all events*, we say, if the reasoning be good for any thing. It is founded on the old system of the tenth toll-dish, and is therefore payable for all that is ground, or else it has no foundation at all. But the learned Baron, feeling the difficulty of holding the position that *personal* tithes are to be paid where the *personal* labour may not produce *profit*, makes the vicar go on to say, “I know that during such a time or during so many months you sold your meal at a profit—you sold without complaint, and you sold in circumstances of credit;—you made therefore a general profit of it, and I fix the particular profit that I am entitled to arising from the grinding.” With deference to his Lordship, we certainly think this last sentence denotes at once, in the strongest degree, the impolicy of tithing *labour* which is employed in *trade or manufacture*. The meal-merchant, who grinds his own meal, must, although unfortunate, either pay tithe for his labour of grinding, or he must acknowledge, nay, not merely acknowledge, but prove, in order to exempt himself from tithe, his trade to be a losing one.

Although tithes are great favourites in our courts of justice, personal tithes form an exception; Easter offerings are said to be a compensation for them; and where they are payable in kind, it is only by custom, such, for instance, as tithe of fish; at the same time we are ready to admit, that tithe of mills is generally looked upon with more favour than other personal tithes, and has effected for itself a broader basis to stand upon than the authority of a mere custom; but we certainly do not approve of extending the doctrine beyond what previous decisions will justly warrant.—If our reasoning be correct, which we are the more inclined to believe, as it agrees with that of three of the learned judges in the Exchequer, we cannot but conclude that so long as *Wilson v. Mason* is law, so long will the decision in *Dr. Browne's* cause be correct. In the latter, as well as in the former case, capital, skill, judgment, and *other* labour, besides the mere labour of grinding, were requisite. It surely cannot be material what is the nature of that *other* labour, so long as its gains are not titheable. Titheable labour and untitheable labour (not to speak of the capital, skill, and judgment employed,) are mixed in the production of a manufacture; and titheable labour is titheable only, if it produce profit; and how then can we estimate the tithe? Is the Clergyman to have a tithe, at all events, if there be the slightest profit on the sale? Suppose that twenty quarters of wheat are purchased by the meal-merchant for 100*l.*, and that he grinds and sells them for 120*l.*, and that 10*l.* is the expense to be deducted for grinding, and that the other 10*l.* (his only profit,) is merely his fair profit as a grinder;—is the clergyman to have his twenty shillings out of this in the first instance,—and before the merchant reaps any return whatever, for his skill, judgment, and *other* labour employed, and risk and capital? We cannot advocate such a doctrine. As we think the case of much importance, we have dedicated a larger portion of our publication to it than we could otherwise have afforded.

OBSERVATIONS ON THE Xth, XXXVIth, AND XXXVIIth CHAPTERS OF ISAIAH.

To the Editor of the Christian Remembrancer.

SIR,—As you used to admit biblical criticisms into your Remembrancer, may I be permitted to request a place for the following, on the 10th, 36th, and 37th chapters of Isaiah, which our best commentators have explained to relate to one and the same event, making the historical detail in the two latter, as a completion of what had been foretold in the former; whereas, it appears to me that they relate to two separate events different in point of time as well as circumstances.

The *Assyrian* had a commission from God to execute his vengeance against a dissembling nation, but it does not appear that *Sennacherib* had any such commission, though he pretended to have it, (36th chap. ver. 10.) nor is it at all probable that he should have been sent by God against *Hezekiah*,—the best and most religious king that ever reigned

in Jerusalem, and who at that very time was destroying the idols that had been erected by former idolatrous kings; and doing all in his power to restore the true worship. (2 Kings, chap. xviii.) With respect to the *point of time*, Sennacherib's punishment was to be almost immediate; the Assyrian's was to be after a long interval; the army of the former was punished upon the spot at the time, and he himself fell soon after by the hands of assassins; but the punishment of the Assyrian is to take place, when God shall have *performed all his work upon Judah and Jerusalem*; that is, as I understand it, when the times of the Gentiles shall be fulfilled, or, in the words of Daniel, chap. xii., at the expiration of time, times, and a half, when God shall have *accomplished to scatter the power of his holy people*; for before that he cannot be said to have performed all his work upon Judah and Jerusalem.

If you think proper to admit this criticism into your publication, I shall be ready, if you approve it, to send you a further comment on the *Assyrian*, giving him what seems to me his proper place in the order of events.

MILLENARIUS.

ON DIVORCE.

THOUGH in particular cases the repugnance of the law to dissolve the obligations of matrimonial cohabitation may operate with great severity upon individuals; yet it must be carefully remembered, that the general happiness of the married life is secured by its indissolubility. When people understand that they *must* live together, except for a very few reasons known to the law, they learn to soften, by mutual accommodation, that yoke which they know they cannot shake off; they become good husbands and good wives from the necessity of remaining husbands and wives; for necessity is a powerful master in teaching the duties which it imposes. If it were once understood, that upon mutual disgust married persons might be legally separated, many couples who now pass through the world with mutual comfort, with attention to their common offspring, and to the moral order of civil society, might have been at this moment living in a state of mutual unkindness; in a state of estrangement from their common offspring; and in a state of the most licentious and unreserved immorality. In this case, as in many others, the happiness of some individuals must be sacrificed to the greater and more general good. *Per Sir W. Scott (Lord Stonell), 1 Haggard's Reports, p. 36.*

SECOND LETTER ON THE DOMESTIC MISCHIEF OF FANATICISM.

MY DEAR SISTER,—If I understand you aright, your arguments chiefly rest upon the supposed fact of a great revival of religion having taken place, in consequence of the exertions of a certain party in the Church connected with the labours of the Dissenters. You

seem to regard this as so evident as to require no proof, and appeal to what we see and hear as decisive on the subject. I am, however, by no means disposed to pass over this alleged fact in a cursory manner, nor to grant so important a concession as that those of the party whom you so much admire have been the chosen instruments of effecting the greatest good, to the exclusion of all who do not pursue the same course.

In the first place, there is no such supernatural revival of religion as you imagine. There has no such change taken place in our days as may not be accounted for on the general principles which are apparent in the divine government. I would by no means deny or undervalue that control of Divine Providence, and that influence of the Holy Spirit, which produce the most beneficial results in the Church; but it does not appear to me that the present commotion in the religious world can justly be traced to other than ordinary causes, producing their usual effects. There is nothing *miraculous* in the present state of things; nothing which might not in some measure have been anticipated by human foresight and produced by human agency. This is not the first, nor, in all probability, will it be the last time, in which a more lively interest is manifested on the subject of religion than at others; and I can easily conceive the possibility of the present agitation of men's minds sinking into as profound a calm as ever existed at any former period. Yet you, with others of the same cast, seem to regard it as a *special* and *final* exertion of divine power, by which the present differences of opinion are produced. You consider it as calling upon all mankind to determine of which party they will be, and insist that all minor things must be lost sight of in one great effort to continue and increase this excitation. If you do not say in so many words, you at least imply, that the present state of things denotes the end of the world to be near; that a final distinction will soon be made between those who serve God and those who serve him not; and that all must then be condemned who do not make the same exertions as yourselves in behalf of the promulgation of your opinions by means of the various religious societies which have been established since the beginning of the present century.

But what is all this but the puritanism of the seventeenth century revived and adapted to the manners of the nineteenth? Did not the same confidence then exist as to the rapid promotion of the kingdom of Christ, by means of similar exertions made by the union of some in the Church with those without its pale? Numbers then believed (as confidently as any now believe) that the time was rapidly approaching when by means of their efforts the kingdoms of this world should become the kingdoms of our Lord. The commotions which they had themselves raised they ascribed to divine agency; they were as certain as you can feel that all with them belonged to the Lord, and all not with them were against him. There was the same readiness to ascribe common events to supernatural causes; the same willingness to believe in an especial outpouring of the Holy Spirit; the same proneness to condemn all, without mercy, who differed from them in opinion. Can you then be so sure, that this *new light* may not, like that which then shone, prove a mere *ignis fatuus*? Can you be so

certain that the effects of the present commotion shall be permanent as to the establishment and promulgation of your tenets? Believe me, it is too much to ask of any one not already blinded by zeal in your cause, to regard the present state of religion as an interposition of heaven in your behalf—And, after all, what is the revival of religion of which you write? I suppose you mean by it a revival of those opinions which you regard as constituting the essence of religion. But what is this to others? they have no such notion of the real nature of religion. A great deal of what passes, with the party you admire, for religion, is, in my opinion, very far from that taught in the New Testament. Taking my idea of a revival of religion from thence, I should conclude it to be manifest in great personal anxiety to secure the mercy of God, implicit obedience to his commandments, and faith in his word, in unfeigned humility, in godly fear. I should think those who were much alive to the importance of religion would be most careful to neglect no relative duty; would, conscious of their own errors and failings, be merciful to those of others; would be doubtful of themselves; would adhere stedfastly to the ordinances of God. Were I, however, to take my idea of a revival of religion from what you so much admire, very different would be the impression on my mind. In this latter case, it seems more generally known by thoughts on the spiritual state of others than a man's ownself; great profession and display; confidence approaching to presumption; an assumed licence for the neglect of common duties in pursuing great objects; indifference to what is near, and regard to what is distant; severe judgment on others who differ from them, and great readiness to forget all differences, however important, in those who will agree with them in a few subjects against their brethren.

It seems a strange thing that a revival of religion should be characterized by a union with those who deny what all Christians regard as essential to the Gospel, by the very men who accuse their brethren of not preaching the Gospel. It seems not very agreeable to the doctrine of the New Testament, that a revival of religion should make Christians indifferent to the repeated injunctions of Holy Writ, to mark those that cause divisions and avoid them.

If, however, you relinquish this ground, and only insist that to the exertions of persons like-minded with yourself, is owing that real conscientiousness and concern for religion which may now exist, without respect to the manner in which they may be developed, I altogether deny the fact, being confident you can bring forward no proof of its existence.

Many, no doubt, among the party in question, are truly conscientious; but you are most egregiously mistaken if you think all are so, or regard conscientiousness as its distinguishing characteristic. Many, also, have a deep interest in religion, but this is not peculiar to them. A plain practical clergyman, endeavouring, to the utmost of his power, to bring all in his own parish to the acknowledgment of the truth, or to retain them in the unity of faith, and at the same time to preserve the spirit of real charity towards all mankind, is, according to my ideas, quite as conscientious, and manifests as deep an interest in religion, as he who wanders about from town to town, invited, admired and caressed,

leaving his parish to the care of a stranger. The calumnies which have been heaped upon many of the clergy on account of their not having joined the societies you most admire, shew little of real conscientiousness, little of real regard to religion. You know, *well know*, that those societies have often been advocated as if they were the *only* societies which were formed for the diffusion of Christianity. It has not been once or twice, but repeatedly, that the real question at issue has been misrepresented, and numbers have gone away from public meetings with the impression that those who did not advocate them were adverse to the promulgation of religious truth, when it certainly was in the power of the speakers to have informed them that they only objected to *that method* of promulgating it which they looked upon as least beneficial, but were anxious and diligent in that which experience had proved was safe and effectual.

But is it in private life you think the effects of a revival of religion, through the instrumentality of this party, is best displayed?—In this case, I beseech you, look to facts and not words.—Where is it that you find better sons and daughters, better brothers and sisters, better wives and husbands, better friends and relatives are thus made? Where is it that this revival produces greater reverence for the sacraments and services of the Church, greater attachment to its interests, greater anxiety to promote its usefulness? On every side do not we hear the complaints of many who suffer from the conduct of those led away by the idea that they are doing great things for the cause of God and religion in the world? You know as well as I do, that a new set of connexions are generally formed, and that these supplant those which formerly existed. The best affections of the heart are often transferred to strangers of whom little is known, except that they advocate the same cause,—and it is in vain for the parent or friend to expostulate. A person is carried away by a new set of ideas which did not strike him before, which charm because they are new, and are deemed true because they charm. So long as the illusion lasts, entreaty and remonstrance, opposed to inclination, are vain;—a new world is opened,—and it is a religious world,—therefore it must be that to which all the best days of life should be given;—the mind is thrown into an unnatural state of excitation, and rejects its former pursuits, not because they are bad, but because they do not minister to its present feelings. Common pleasures and consolations are disregarded, and common duties also; and because this is the case, it is concluded that higher pleasures and higher duties occupy the mind,—and this is regarded as a proof of a revival of religion.—That you may never be deceived by such an imaginary proof, is the earnest wish and prayer of
Your affectionate Brother.

G A M I N G.

THE fatal consequences of Gaming, the inevitable ruin which it entails on those who yield themselves up to its delusions, have long been felt and acknowledged by all who have escaped its wretched fascination. To strengthen our experience, science had also explored

this region, and the most distinguished philosophers of modern times, from Bernouilli and Demoivre to Garnier and Laplace, have concurred in determining, as the result of the most elaborate analysis, founded on the simplest and most obvious rules of human action, that he who gives himself up to gambling, must, in the long run, be ruined.

The following striking details, furnished by an ex-farmer of the Parisian gaming-houses, will throw a new light on this miserable pursuit, and may perhaps produce a conviction of its folly on some who are alike inaccessible to the dictates of science and religion. Into what a vortex they plunge who stake their property in these establishments, rightly termed Hells, will appear from the immense gains which enable them to meet the following expenditure :—

	Francs.
The farmers of the public gaming-houses, who are exclusively privileged, pay the city of Paris the annual sum of.	5,500,000
The <i>Pots de vin</i> and presents that they take upon themselves, or that are put upon them, amount annually to	1,500,000
The farmers are allowed, out of the profits, for expences of administration and service.	1,800,000
The profits of the farmers, per month, are estimated at 200,000, which give for the year	2,400,000
The city of Paris, besides 5,000,000 mentioned above, takes 3-4ths of the profits, which yield annually	7,200,000
	<hr/> 18,400,000

From this sketch it is evident that the gaming-houses of Paris cost annually, to those who pay them—that is, gamesters—the enormous sum of 18,000,000 francs, which is a larger amount than is received by all the collectors of direct taxes in the capital.

OBSERVATIONS ON THE 7th VERSE OF THE XVIIIth CHAPTER OF ST. MATTHEW.

To the Editor of the Christian Remembrancer.

SIR,—Believing that you think nothing unimportant which affects the exposition of the Sacred Volume, I venture to send you this.

At the 7th verse of the 18th chapter of St. Matthew, in our authorised version, the usual mark is placed which denotes a change in the subject. I think the mark in this instance is likely to mislead the reader, for the 7th verse appears to me to be a natural continuation of our Saviour's discourse. In reply to the enquiry of his disciples,—‘Who is the greatest in the kingdom of Heaven?’ our Saviour answered, ‘he who shall humble himself as this little child,’—referring to a child who stood amongst them. The meaning of this evidently is, the humble believer,—he who rests not upon his own works, he who no more claims a reward for his own merit than a child can,—is the greatest favourite of Heaven. In the 5th verse our Saviour declares, that he who should receive one such little child, that is, one such believer, in his name, received him; and in the 6th verse he shews the greatness of

their guilt who should 'offend one of these little ones,'—one such humble believer. Now, without referring to the original, the meaning of 'offend,' in this passage, plainly is, he who causeth another to sin.—See 8th and 9th verses. Does not, then, the 7th verse naturally follow? 'Woe unto the world because of offences!' Woe unto those who cause others to err. 'For it must needs be that offences come; but woe to that man by whom the offence cometh.' For this being a probationary state, such temptations must come, but woe to that man by whom the temptation cometh. In the 8th and 9th verses, our Saviour shews, by a strong metaphor, that it is necessary that every man should use violence towards his own passions and desires, if they offend, if they should cause him to sin. Our Saviour then declares, that a 'little' one,—a man possessing neither rank, talents, nor wealth, but a humble believer in the Gospel, is precious in the sight of his Father in Heaven.

This, Sir, seems to me to be the sense of the passage to which I have alluded, but I know there are great authorities against me.

The pious and learned Bishop Middleton, in his work on the Doctrine of the Greek Article (p. 240) expressed his opinion that our Saviour entered upon a new subject at the 7th verse; and that the offences alluded to are the calamities and persecutions which threatened the Christian Church. Such also, he tells us, was the opinion of Voesselt, approved by Schleusner. Michaelis, too, in his version after 'offences,' inserts "which the world will take at the Gospel."

Is not this supposed allusion somewhat improbable, especially as it is not continued in the following verses? There is no doubt our Saviour, by 'offences,' might allude to the public persecutions by which the Church in the first ages was so frequently visited; but looking at the context, I am disposed to think that the offences alluded to are of a more private and general kind. In the two following verses, he certainly alludes to those 'offences' which proceed out of a man's own heart.

I am your obedient servant,

C. R.

MONTHLY REGISTER.

SOCIETY FOR PROMOTING CHRISTIAN KNOWLEDGE.

LIVERPOOL DISTRICT COMMITTEE.

THE Liverpool District Committee, in commencing their Report for the past year, consider it their duty first to return their thanks to the numerous supporters and friends of this Institution, and, at the same time, to congratulate them on the present improved state of its finances. Of the important services rendered to it by our Diocesan, they must ever retain a grateful recollection; his kind and

zealous exertions excited a general and lively interest in its favour, which has since been manifested by an accession of *four hundred and eighty-nine* new annual subscribers to the District Fund; besides donations from *one hundred and twenty-one* individuals, and sundry sums of five shillings and under, amounting in the whole to 183*l.* 16*s.* 6*d.* And, in the course of the year, the sum of 121*l.* 13*s.* 11½*d.*

was collected in the several churches named as follows, for the sole use and benefit of the District Fund.

	£	s.	d.
St. Paul's, by the Rev. W. Hesketh, M. A.	11	11	5
St. Peter's, by the Rev. P. Bulmer, M. A.	13	9	1
St. George's, (on its re-opening, 11th Sept. 1825,) by the Rev. J. Brooks, M. A.	60	9	11
St. John's, by the Rev. David Hewitt, B. A.	14	3	6½
St. Thomas', (Litherland,) by the Rev. W. Rawson, M. A.	16	6	6
Crosby Chapel, by the Rev. Jacob Hodgson.	5	13	6
Total.	£121	13	11½

By the liberality which has been thus seasonably extended to them, the Committee have been enabled to relieve the Institution from the incum-

brance of a burdensome debt, and also to open a new depository, in Ranelagh-street, for the sale of the Society's publications, not only to its members, but to the public at large, on very low and advantageous terms. In addition, likewise, to the Parochial Libraries enumerated in their last Report, the Committee have established a general Circulating Library composed of the books on the Society's list, to which there are, at present, upwards of *sixty* subscribers, at the rate of *two shillings* each per annum; and there is great reason to hope, that from this new establishment, the lower and the labouring classes of the community will derive the means of both instruction and amusement.

The following is an account of the number and description of books which have hitherto been distributed by the Committee:

	Bibles.	Testaments.	Prayer Books.	Bd. Books, Tracts, and School Bks.	Cards.	Total.
From its first opening in May, 1816, to the 31st of Dec. 1814 ..	2851	2603	10426	77040	124212	217135
From the 1st Jan. 1825, to the 31st Dec. 1825, inclusive.	806	684	2211	*20762	18094	42557
Total number of Books dispersed by the Committee between May, 1816, and the 31st of December, 1825.	3660	3287	12637	97802	142306	259692

The Committee have great satisfaction in observing, that the foregoing statement exhibits a pleasing proof of a recent and considerable increase in the demand for the Society's publications, which may justly be attributed to the new arrangements which have been lately formed for the better accommodation of the public. The number of books, &c. issued during the last year, consisted of 806 Bibles, 684 Testaments, 2211 Prayer Books, 20,762 Tracts and School Books, and 18,094 Cards; making an excess of 146 Bibles, 125 Testaments, 767 Prayer Books, 4880 bound Books, Tracts and School Books; which, taken collectively, amounts to 5918

beyond the distribution of the former year. The total number, therefore, of the books, &c. issued by the Committee from the first opening of their Depository in the year 1816, to the 31st December, 1825, will be found to amount to *two hundred and fifty-nine thousand six hundred and ninety-two*. Of the benefits likely to ensue from so vast and general a dispersion of the Scriptures, the Book of Common Prayer, and of moral and religious Tracts, among the poor of this populous town and neighbourhood for their edification and comfort, it is hardly possible to form a just and proper estimate, since the salutary effects thereby produced may, under the

* Of these, 1823 were bound, 6536 Tracts half-bound, and the remaining 13,003 were School Books.

divine blessing, be transmitted to succeeding generations.

In regard to the Charity Schools in the town of Liverpool and its vicinity, in connexion with the Established Church, the Committee have only to state, that to those enumerated in a former Report, two more are to be added, the one established by the Trustees of the School in St. James's Road, and the other lately opened at Edge Hill: the former for the reception of 105 girls; and the latter of 103 boys, and 40 girls. The schools, therefore, which have been thus far supplied by the Committee with the Society's Tracts and Papers, amount in number to *thirty-nine*, in which about five thousand seven hundred children are now receiving their education.

Of the children educated in the Blue Coat Hospital, seventy-three having, in the course of the year, completed their respective terms, the like number of Bibles and Prayer Books were presented, by an order of the Committee, to *fifty-seven* boys and *sixteen* girls, who, by their good behaviour, had recommended themselves to the notice of the Governors.

A set of books contained in the Parochial Lending Library, consisting of thirty volumes, was given, by the

Committee, to the Liverpool Infirmary for the use of the sick patients; and to the Lunatic Asylum, seven Bibles and twenty-four Prayer Books were also granted for the like purpose. To the Parochial Lending Library at St. Paul's, the books inserted in the supplemental Catalogue were, in like manner, added by the Committee.

The Committee direct the attention of the Subscribers to the present promising state of the District Fund. To their Treasurer every acknowledgment is due for his active exertions in behalf of this Institution. It will appear from his accounts, that notwithstanding the extraordinary expenditure of the year, necessarily occasioned by the fitting up of the New Depository, and the considerable addition which has been made to the former stock of books, in order to meet the daily demands of the public; there was not a debt, incurred by the Committee, which has not been discharged; nor is there a single arrear of the annual subscriptions which remains to be called for by his successor. There is a balance, moreover, of 211*l.* 16*s.* 10*d.* due to the fund: besides the value of the stock of books in hand, which has been recently estimated at 317*l.* and upwards.

DONCASTER DISTRICT COMMITTEE.

Eighth Annual Report, read in the Parish Vestry, on Saturday, the 11th of March, 1826.

WE are not informed whether the meeting was numerously attended, or whether the public were invited to be instructed by the excellent Report, and to be encouraged by its cheering statements, to be liberal in their contributions. We are glad to observe the names of many of the laity amongst the subscribers, and that in some parishes small sums of 5*s.* and 2*s.* 6*d.* have been subscribed: this is as it should be; it is the duty of *all* classes to subscribe, and all should be applied to and made acquainted with their duty.

EXTRACT FROM REPORT.

The Committee of members of the Society for Promoting Christian Know-

ledge within the deanery of Doncaster, in presenting the Eighth Annual Report of their proceedings, beg to inform the subscribers and friends of this Institution, that in the course of the year ending December 31, 1825, the following number of Bibles, Prayer-books, and Tracts, have been issued from the local depository:—Bibles, 195; Testaments, 182; Common Prayer, 588; Psalters, 113; bound books, 496; tracts, 6730; school books, 2835.—And in order that the public at large may be enabled to form a correct opinion of the importance of such an institution, and thereby to appreciate its very great local utility, the following statement is given of the number of books

which have been distributed by its means in the town and neighbourhood of Doncaster, since its first establishment in the year 1818:—1093 Bibles; 1141 Testaments; 2858 Prayer-books; and upwards of thirty thousand approved religious books and tracts.

But the Committee have reserved the most important information which they have on the present occasion to communicate to their friends, to the conclusion of their Report. Convinced of the peculiar benefits and importance of parochial lending libraries, they have at all times, in conformity with the directions and practice of the Society, been anxious to render every assistance in their power towards the formation of them. Six years have now elapsed since the Society, by their annual report, and circulars addressed to the parochial clergy, endeavoured to call the attention of the religious public to the advantages to be derived from this mode of circulating its various publications. That the pious intentions of the Society in this respect have not been so generally carried into effect as might have been expected, has, perhaps, arisen from local circumstances; but the importance of lending libraries has now become so plainly obvious, that the Committee hope, ere long, to see them not only established in every parish, however small, but attached to every school within the deanery.

The Committee, in closing this the Eighth Report of their proceedings, feel assured that the information which it contains of the increasing prosperity and usefulness of this institution, will afford much gratification to its numerous friends and supporters within the deanery. When it is borne in mind that during the last year, no less a sum than sixty-two thousand pounds has been expended by the Society in promoting its various benevolent objects, and that by its means upwards of forty-nine thousand Bibles and nearly two hundred thousand Testaments and Prayer-books have in the same space of time been distributed; its friends may surely be allowed to indulge the pleasing hope that their

"labours have not been in vain," but that some of the good seed, so plentifully sown, has "fallen on good ground," and will, by the Divine blessing, "bring forth fruit unto everlasting life." While, therefore, your Committee pledge themselves with renewed activity and zeal "to plant and to water," in the firm but humble hope that the seed thus sown will be matured in God's good time into a rich and plentiful harvest, they consider themselves justified, from the highest motives, in recommending this venerable and truly Christian Society to the zealous and affectionate support of all who have at heart the present and eternal welfare of their poorer fellow-creatures—a Society in which "simplicity and godly sincerity" have ever been conspicuous, and which by the most temperate and unobjectionable means has ever been found steadily pursuing its benevolent object, "the promotion of true and genuine Christianity throughout the world."

Treasurer's Account of Receipts and Payments from January 1st, to December 31st, 1825.

RECEIPTS.

	£.	s.	d.
Balance in the Treasurer's hands, 1st of January, 1825	144	1	11
Annual Subscriptions to District Committee	93	16	6
Donations to ditto.....	1	11	6
Subscriptions and Donations on Society's Account	52	0	0
Tickhill Subscriptions, one-third	9	3	4
Collection at Doncaster Church	41	14	11
Ditto at Rotherham Church ..	8	3	6
Ditto at Treeton Church	6	16	6
By Sale of Books.....	102	11	6
	£ 459	19	8

PAYMENTS.

	£.	s.	d.
Remittances to Society	245	3	9
Postages, Printing, &c.	27	9	7
Balance in Treasurer's hands 31st December, 1825	187	6	4
	£ 459	19	8

SOCIETY FOR THE PROPAGATION OF THE GOSPEL.

DONCASTER DISTRICT COMMITTEE.

WE have great pleasure in presenting our readers with the First Report of the Doncaster District Committee of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts, held in the Parish Vestry, on Saturday, the 11th day of March, 1826; and we trust we shall receive many similar communications. We must, however, express our regret, in having noticed the names of only *twelve* laymen amongst the subscribers. We should, indeed, have been glad to have learnt that the meeting had been numerously attended by them, as well as that their subscriptions had been liberal. The Society cannot be supported in a way worthy of the Gospel which it propagates, unless the members of our Church are made to appreciate its high claims and importance.

Patron—The Venerable Archdeacon Markham.

President—Sir W. B. Cooke, Bart.

Treasurers—Sir W. B. Cooke, Bart. and Co.

Secretaries—The Rev. P. Ashworth, and P. Naylor, Esq.

EXTRACT FROM REPORT.

The Doncaster District Committee beg to lay before the public the subjoined statement of their receipts and expenditure during the past year. Since the establishment of the Committee in December, 1824, they have the pleasure to report, that thirty-nine subscribers have been obtained, and that upwards of 70*l.* have been transmitted by the Secretaries to the Society.

The Doncaster Committee anxiously entreat the friends of the Established Church within the deanery, to co-operate with them in obtaining additional subscribers to the funds of the Society, being fully assured, that the more its truly Christian objects and labours are known, the greater support will it receive from those who, having themselves felt the blessings and consolations of the Gospel of Christ, are anxious to diffuse the knowledge of the same, in all its native

purity, among the unconverted nations of the world. If, as we are assured by God himself, speaking by the mouth of his Prophet, "that from the rising of the sun even to the going down of the same, his name shall be great among the Gentiles," and that "all the kingdoms of the world shall become the kingdom of our Lord and of his Christ"—happy surely are those Christians, who shall be the instruments of accomplishing what Providence so graciously intends; and who, sharing in the heavenly work, shall share also in the glorious rewards promised to those who "turn men from darkness to light, and from the power of Satan unto God." True, the particular "times and seasons we know not," for "God hath reserved them in his own power;" but this we know, that "go ye unto all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature," was the last solemn injunction of our Lord, not only to his then disciples, but to all who should hereafter believe in his name; and, therefore, the joint obligations of gratitude and of duty imperiously require us to endeavour, by every legitimate means in our power, to enlarge the borders of Christ's kingdom upon earth, and to refresh with the "day-spring from on high" those who yet sit in darkness and the shadow of death."

Nor let it be for one moment imagined, that this Society, during the long time it has now, under the blessing of heaven, been employed in "Propagating the Gospel," has, in any degree, interfered with that "for Promoting Christian Knowledge." As the revenues of the latter Society are principally expended in providing Bibles, Prayer-books, and other books of religious instruction, so those of the former are entirely devoted to the support of missions and schools among the heathen, and the dispersed of our own brethren in foreign parts. Formed nearly at the same period of time, and founded by the same benevolent individuals, these societies have ever been

united in principles and practice, having always carried on their operations in dutiful subordination to the heads of the Church, and in strict accordance with our ecclesiastical polity. It is therefore much to be desired, that their claims upon the zealous and liberal support of every Christian, but more especially of every member of the Established Church, were more thoroughly understood, and more justly appreciated. Let it not be said, that while the members of other communions are zealous and active in the missionary cause, the friends of the Church of England are lukewarm and indifferent. "Let them remember, that they cannot better express their thankfulness to God, for the spiritual blessings they enjoy, than by endeavouring to impart to others, that

form of sound words, and those means of saving grace, the possession of which is their own glorious and inestimable privilege."

Treasurer's Account of Receipts and Payments, from December 4th, 1824, to December 31st, 1825.

RECEIPTS.		£.	s.	d.
Annual Subscriptions received		40	8	6
Donations		38	6	0
		£78 11 6		

PAYMENTS.		£.	s.	d.
Remittances to the Society ..		70	8	2
Advertising, Stationery, Printing, &c.		8	6	4
		£78 14 6		

LAST month it was our pleasing duty to record the presentation of a piece of plate to Archdeacon Barnes by his brother-clergymen: we now joyfully refer to the marks of respect which have been paid to him by other branches of the community, in testimony of the high sense they entertain of his services. We indeed heartily rejoice in these concurrent testimonies of gratitude and respect, not merely because the zeal and pious exertions of the excellent Archdeacon deserve them, but because they shew that he has left in the hearts, and we trust we may say also in the lives of his flock, a lively and lasting proof of the success of his mission.

LETTER FROM THE GOVERNMENT SECRETARY ON BEHALF OF THE GOVERNOR IN COUNCIL.

To the Venerable George Barnes, D.D.
Archdeacon.

SIR—I have the honour to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 1st, soliciting permission to be received on board the James Sibbald, on your return to England.

The honourable the governor in council has directed me to express the satisfaction which he has derived

from the manner in which you have executed the important duties of your station; since, from your being the first Archdeacon, your situation was more than usually arduous and interesting; and that, in the opinion of the governor in council, the great improvement which has taken place in every branch of the department over which you presided is mainly ascribable to your zeal and judgment.

The governor in council has directed me to assure you of the esteem and good wishes of every member of this government.

The governor in council is pleased to appoint the Rev. Thomas Carr, A.B. to act as Archdeacon from the date of your departure to England.

I have the honour to be, Sir,

Your most obedient Servant,

D. GREENHILL,

ACTING SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT.
Bombay Castle, 5th Nov. 1825.

ADDRESS OF A GENERAL MEETING.

To the Venerable George Barnes, D.D.
Archdeacon of Bombay.

VENERABLE AND DEAR SIR,—We the undersigned, cannot permit you to leave Bombay, without manifesting

to you our respect and esteem. It is impossible to think of your departure without regret, but that regret is much softened by knowing that you are returning in health to your family and native country; and we hope it will be some source of delight to you, to be assured by this address of the affectionate regard for your character with which your amiable manners and cheerful piety have inspired us. We shall indeed feel your loss, and it will be our earnest endeavour, at our charitable, religious, and other institutions, to follow the example which you have set us, in the foundation, the encouragement, and the management of those societies, the records of which will perpetuate your talents, your zeal, and your success.

You have now lived amongst us for more than eleven years, and of the persons selected to compose the hierarchy which was established at the time of your arrival by the wisdom of the legislature, you alone have survived to feel and to bear witness in England to its beneficial results. It will be no unworthy pride for you and your children to cherish the remembrance of the public admiration and private friendship which your conduct in your high office has produced. Its novelty in India, and the delicacy of its duties, were calculated to have appalled a man of more advanced age and greater experience—but your learning, your good sense, and the kindness of your disposition have, to a wonderful degree, reconciled all difficulties. It will not, we trust, be unwelcome to you, that we express our desire of possessing some memorial of the pure theology which we have so many times heard delivered by you from the pulpit—and we warmly solicit, that you

will select a number of your excellent discourses, in order that they may be printed for the benefit of ourselves and of our latest posterity, and prove permanent incentives to virtue, piety, and true religion.

There is also one other request which we intreat you not to refuse. The charity schools, in a great measure instituted by your zeal, and fostered ever by your patronage and influence, are no longer matter of promise. They have realised the hopes of the most sanguine. We are anxious to place your portrait, in your professional robes, in one of those schools—and we hope you will allow it to be painted and engraved by the best artists, so that an impression of it may form a frontispiece to the volume of your sermons.

We shall ever pray continually for your happiness—and if it shall please Providence to enlarge in your native land the sphere of your piety and usefulness in your holy ministration, we are persuaded that you will not forget the smaller circle of the public which admired you in Bombay, and your private friends, who can cease only with life to revere and esteem your memory.

We are, your sincere and affectionate friends, .

(Signed) FRANCIS WARDEN,
and a long list of signatures.

It was also resolved at the meeting, that a subscription should be entered into to defray the expenses of the portrait, and that the surplus should be invested at interest, to provide a certain number annually of gold and silver medals, to be distributed amongst the best scholars, and to be called *Barnes's Medals*.

POLITICAL RETROSPECT.

BURMESE WAR.—The negotiations which were opened, it is known, terminated abruptly. As soon as the terms proposed by the British Government were laid before the King of Ava, he, as the papers state, flew into a most violent

passion, and instantly sent off orders for the war to be carried on with the most vigorous exertions. From this we may learn that this nation possesses not so much diplomatic cunning as has been ascribed to them; for had the

treaty been proposed merely to gain time, the terms would not have been rejected in so peremptory a manner. If they cannot be denominated barbarians, they certainly possess one of their characteristics,—they attack without fear, and fly without shame. The following minute account of the conference is sufficiently curious to be extracted.

"It appears that the British commissioners reached Nemben-ziek on the evening of the 30th ultimo, where the ground was found prepared for the encampment of the respective chiefs, with their attendants, and a lotoo, or hall of audience, erected in the intermediate space, equi-distant from the British and the Burmese lines. At a few minutes before two o'clock, on the 2d instant, two Burmese officers of rank arrived in our camp to conduct Sir A. Campbell to the lotoo. Lieutenant Colonel Tidy, and Lieutenant Smith, R. N. were dispatched at the same time to the Burmese cantonment, to pay a similar compliment to the Kee Woongee. At two o'clock Major General Sir A. Campbell and Commodore Sir J. Brisbane, accompanied by their respective suites, proceeded to the lotoo and met the Burmese Commissioners, Kee Woongee and Lay Mayn Wom, entering the Hall, arrayed in splendid state dresses. After much shaking of hands, the whole party being seated on chairs, Sir A. Campbell opened the conferences with an appropriate address to the Woongees, who replied in courteous and suitable terms, and expressed their hope that the first day of their acquaintance might be given up to private friendship, and the consideration of public business deferred until the next meeting. This was readily assented to, and a desultory conversation then ensued, in the course of which the Woongees conducted themselves in the most polite and conciliatory manner, inquiring after the latest news from England, the state of the King's health, &c. &c. and offering to accompany Sir A. Campbell to Rangoon, England, or wherever he might point out.

"On the following day the appointed

meeting took place, for the purpose of discussing formally the terms of peace, at which the following officers were present on our side, viz.—Major General Sir A. Campbell, K. C. B.; Commodore Sir J. Brisbane, C. B.; Brigadier-General Cotton; Captain Alexander, C. B.; Brigadier McCreach, C. B.; Lieutenant-Colonel Tidy, C. B.; and Captain Snodgrass.

"On the part of the Government of Ava, the following Chiefs were present:—Sada Mengee Maha Mengom-kee Woongee; Munnoo Rut'ha Keogong-Lay Mayn Woon; Mengee Maha Menlajah Attawoon; Maha Sri Sencrawoodcock Mengee Maha Menla Sear Sry Shuagom Mooagoonoon; and Mengee Attala Maha Sri Soo-Asse-woon.

"In the discussions which took place on this important occasion, the principal object of the Woongees was to persuade the British commissioners to withdraw the demands for territorial cessions, and indemnification for the expenses of the war. They dwelt at some length on their Chinese war, which had terminated, they said, without exaction or permanent sacrifices on either part, and the two countries had ever since lived in peace and friendship. Finding that no material relaxation could be obtained in the terms originally offered, the Woongees changed their tone, and requested a prolongation of the armistice, to enable them to refer to their court on points of so much importance. This request was granted, and an extension of the armistice was accordingly agreed upon until the 2d of November. Before parting, an exchange of prisoners was proposed by Sir A. Campbell, and assented to. The Burmese commissioners promised, that the whole of the British and American subjects in their hands should be liberated and sent to the British head-quarters without delay, requesting that the Rajahs of Mergui and Tavoy, with their followers, now at this presidency, might be given up in return.

"Sir A. Campbell having invited the Burmese commissioners to dine with him on the following day, 12 o'clock, on the 4th instant, a repast was served up in the lotoo, now converted into a banqueting hall. The Woongees, Attawoons, and Woodocks, twelve in

number, were punctual in their attendance, and did ample justice to the dinner, in the course of which a bumper was drank to the health of the King and Royal Family of Ava. The Burmese commissioners appeared to be much delighted with the attentions they experienced, observing that the meeting of the chiefs of the two contending armies at a public entertainment, in the midst of war, was an extraordinary proof of mutual good faith and confidence, and worthy of two such great and civilized nations, who they hoped would never encounter each other again in arms. And Ata-woon added, that the sun and moon were under an eclipse, but that when peace was restored, they would shine in the astonished world, with increased brilliancy and splendour.

"Further negotiations and proceedings were of course suspended until the decision of the court of Ava should be known on the communications made by its commissioners.

"The dispatches state, that the army at Prome continues in excellent health, and is well supplied with provisions and cattle.

NEW BANKERS ACT.—We think a short statement of the act, under which the business of a banker in the country is to be carried on, may be acceptable. A partnership, consisting of more than six persons, may carry on business as bankers at any place exceeding the distance of 65 miles from London. Every member of a partnership to be responsible for all bills or notes issued, or sums borrowed. Such partnership not to pay or issue notes within the prescribed limits; nor to draw upon any person resident within such limits any bill of exchange payable on demand, or for less than 50*l.*—Secretary of partnership to make out a return annually, containing the name of the firm, the several partners therein, and public officers thereof, which is to be registered in the Stamp-office.—Partnerships may sue or be sued,

either at law or in equity, in the name of their public officer; and a judgment or decree against him to be available against the property of any individual member of it.—Bank of England may empower agents to carry on banking business for them at any places in England.

CORN LAWS.—On Wednesday, April 19, Sir F. Burdett said, in the House of Commons, that he could not approve himself so great a patriot, "he must honestly confess," as to vote for the repeal of the corn laws, if it would injure his interests as a land-owner. Now all parties allow this honourable member's patriotism to be above the average patriotism in the house, and he has only said openly, what every body knew before, that members of the House of Commons, like other people, look most after their own interest. The agricultural interest, directly or indirectly, embraces the bulk of the legislature. Therefore the high authority which imposed restrictions on corn, resolves itself into this: that those whose wealth depended on the price of corn, excluded others from competing with them. This is a mere *fact*, not open to dispute; and, if it be so, we, the country at large, having an interest in our own sustenance, may presume, without disrespect, to think a little for ourselves. We will say no more of the *origin* of the corn laws: we will state, first, the effects of them, and, secondly, the footing which general expediency requires them to be set on. *Prohibiting* foreign corn assumes the fact, which no one disputes, that without prohibition we should have corn cheaper than it now is: that which prevents corn becoming cheap, in other words, makes it dearer:

that is, compels us to give an additional quantity of labour for what we could otherwise get for less. But if prohibition diminishes the return to labour, and makes industry more unproductive, it is tantamount to a partial curse of sterility upon the land, and incapacity on our arms. Let us see this a little farther. In forty or fifty years, at the present rate of increase, there will be half as many persons again in England as at present; and they are all to be fed from home production, for fear we should be dependent on foreign countries, or the landowners be impoverished. These last comers must be fed from poorer lands than those now in cultivation. Now, if a man goes from loam to clay, from clay to sand, from sand to bog, from bog to granite, he will continually get less and less for every handful of seed he flings into the ground: in other words, his profits diminish. Now, we may be quite sure all other profits, on the average throughout the country, diminish in the same proportion; for no one would be fool enough to work Bagshot-heath for $2\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. on his capital, if he could get double for making hats. We have no room to shew now, what every body at this time of day admits, that profits in all channels bear a certain proportion to each other, and one cannot fall permanently without the others. Granting this,—and no one, we think, will dispute it,—the chain is complete. An increasing population and prohibition induce the cultivation of poor soils—diminished return to capital—curtailed profits; and profits are the fund out of which the industry of the country is fed, her ingenuity employed, and her increase permitted. The withering

away of this fund is the necessary result of the corn laws.

If we admit corn freely, our price is regulated by the average produce of the whole commercial world, i. e. will be nearly stationary. When we depend on our own supplies alone, our prices vary with the seasons, and far more than the variations in the quantity of the produce. It is well known that if the crop falls off one-eighth, prices rise far more than one-eighth; and if the crop is one-eighth *above* an average crop, prices fall far more than one-eighth. Now, look at the effect of this variable price. Prices are low; no landlord will make a long lease when he thinks they will rise:—prices are high, no tenant will take a long lease when he thinks they will fall. And what tenant will expend his capital on land, from which he is liable to be turned out when his landlord chooses? His object will be to exhaust it to the utmost for his present gain. The loss to the country is incalculable. This is a necessary consequence of the corn laws.

But then they prevent our being dependent on foreign countries. We are dependent on foreign countries for our marine supplies: yet, here we are. The facilities and opportunities of obtaining corn are ten times greater than of obtaining pitch, hemp, timber, &c. Suppose we are perfectly independent of other countries, and produce every thing we consume: having no commerce, we should have no navy; and what is there in our soil and climate, that we should rather depend on *them* alone than on our own enterprise in seeking commodities where they can be got cheapest? No one will go for corn elsewhere, if he can raise it with

as little labour here; and if he can employ himself on something else which will sell for more corn abroad than he could raise with the same labour at home, the country is so many bushels the gainer. Who sees the corn growing? What does it signify, when the corn lies in Mark-lane, whether it grew in Middlesex, or came from Poland in exchange for South-down wool, or Leeds broadcloth? All the country has to do is to eat it,—the cheaper the better. In short, is not this dependence so much dreaded, the foundation of our greatness? We seek every thing over the world where it can be got cheapest. Why should we, indeed, depend upon our soil and climate, which are not superior to those of our neighbours, rather than upon our industry and enterprise? We set the continent to work with our capital: they cannot afford to consume their productions themselves. England is the rich man among nations. What would be said of a rich man who would make himself independent of others, by raising his own supplies in defiance of local difficulties? Every outlay would bring loss, and he would cease to be rich.

Suppose the farmer is compelled to raise his prices to 84s.—in comes foreign corn, in exhaustless supplies, as cheap as dirt,—just as the farmer's expenses have compelled him to raise his prices. Nothing can shew the absurdity of the present system more than this.

Suppose a deficient crop. How are we to live? We must go to foreign markets as strangers,—where nobody has calculated on our demand, and buy under every disadvantage. Suppose an over-abundant crop. We cannot sell

our over-plus; for the corn laws have screwed up our prices to double that of our neighbours. Then follows a glut—the agriculturists are ruined—and have to thank their own corn laws.

How are things to be put on a proper footing? The land-owners say they have exclusive burdens imposed on them by the legislature, poor-rates, &c.—very true—and it amounts to about 7s. a quarter. Well, they ask 7s. a quarter more from their customers. But if foreign merchants are admitted who have not this burthen to bear, our own producers would be undersold, even supposing the cost of production otherwise the same. This they justly complain of. The wealth of individuals is the wealth of the nation. Individuals look too sharp after their own interest to need goading to it. So it may be laid down as an axiom, that whatever forces capital from the channels in which the persons most interested in its success would place it, tends *pro tanto* to impoverish the country. Then if you lay exclusive burdens on the land-owners, and admit unburdened competitors, you forcibly drive capital from agriculture, and therefore, *pro tanto*, impoverish the country. So far we go with the land-owners.—(We are no enemies to them,—they are at least as useful, and perhaps the most respectable of all classes.) A duty, therefore, of 7s. a quarter on foreign corn—or, to avoid all cavil, of 10s. or 12s., would put them in the same situation as if they had no *exclusive* burdens; that is, as if all capital were taxed alike,—manufactures, land, and everything else. Then if this duty leaves all commodities in this country on the same footing, no capital will be forced from its natural course. But if you go a jot beyond, and

give any additional advantage to land-owners over others, capital will be forcibly driven to land, and the country, *pro tanto*, impoverished. The very argument of the land-owners is still good. We cannot permit them to blow hot and cold at the same minute. The only argument, and it is undoubtedly a good one, on which they insist on a duty equivalent to their own exclusive burthens, militates against any duty (sometimes called

a protection) one shilling beyond. The present corn laws are framed neither on this nor any other principle, except what Sir Francis has ventured to avow, the interest of the land-owners. Those of our readers who profess the same principles as ourselves, the interests of all classes whatever, shoeblacks, scholars, and land-owners *en masse*, will be anxious to see an alteration whenever the tranquillity of men's minds will bear the discussion.

UNIVERSITY AND CLERICAL INTELLIGENCE.

The following has appeared in several of the newspapers:

"CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY ELECTION.

A very general expression of regret having manifested itself among the members of the University at the practice of out-voters receiving their expenses from the respective candidates for whom they voted; the undersigned resident Members of the Senate earnestly recommend that this practice should not be renewed at the ensuing Election." This is signed by seven Masters of Colleges, nine Professors, the Public Orator, and several other distinguished Members of the University.

Since the above appeared, a Letter has been published, addressed by the Master of Corpus Christi College and Professor Henslow to the Vice Chancellor, detailing the circumstances which gave rise to this novel proceeding.

It is stated that the expenses of two of the Candidates at the last Election, arising from paying the expenses of the out-voters, were very considerable; and that it was apparent that the practice would be continued at the next. That it was indeed openly declared, that "whatever might have been the expenses of the last Election, they were nothing when compared with those which would probably be incurred at the next."

It appears that the subject became a topic of general conversation, and a source of almost universal regret. Accordingly the committees of Lord Palmerston, the Attorney General, and Mr. Goulbourn mutually agreed not to pay the expenses of any voters, and applied to the committee of Mr. Banks for a promise to the same effect. This, however, that gentleman's committee declined. Upon this, the London

committee of the Attorney General did not think it advisable that their candidate should pledge himself to any measure which was not equally binding upon all the others. They, at the same time, suggested that "some public declaration of the University would be more likely to have weight with the fourth committee than any representation which might originate with the other three committees."

The authors of the Letter, in conclusion, state a few facts which shew the abuses which have originated in the practice of paying such expenses. They observe, "Neither of us were ever engaged on any former committee, and therefore we cannot be considered competent witnesses in substantiating the truth of those abuses, to which it is reported the system we complain of has given birth. But as this Letter, and the proceedings it details, rest upon the supposition that these reports are not without good foundation, we assure you that we have been careful in tracing some of them to such authority as will not permit us to doubt their accuracy. If it be said that a notice was placed in the committee rooms, requesting all gentlemen to pay their share of the expenses, for the use of conveyances and accommodations provided by the candidates; *we know*, on the other hand, that it has been sometimes privately intimated, that it was not necessary to attend to this notice. If it be said that refusing to pay the expenses of all out-voters would indirectly deprive some, who cannot afford the journey, of their elective franchise, we ask whether it may not be far preferable to refuse assistance to the few persons (if indeed there be any) of this description, than to uphold a system which has already been so far abused, that one

member of the senate (not a poor man) modestly demanded, and was paid, the expenses of his journey, together with those incurred by a week's entertainment of his wife and family at an hotel? Is it right to tolerate a practice which has tempted another to produce a bill, of considerable amount, for the expenses of certain excursions which, in the abundance of his zeal, he was pleased to undertake in the function of a canvasser? We know, from the authority of an eye witness, that the current report is perfectly true, which states that a gentleman from Lincolnshire, who came to Cambridge at the last Election in *his own carriage*, both demanded and received payment for the expense of posting (here and back again) after the contest was over.

"These instances, with some others equally flagrant, are in the mouth of every one, and are surely sufficient to justify us in the steps we have taken; but when we add the following circumstance which has just come under our personal observation, we cannot but think that those who feel most inclined to defend the system, will allow it to be high time to put some check to the rapacity likely to be practised upon the purses of future candidates. The fact we allude to is not a solitary one, in which a candidate has been applied to by gentlemen who have declared their willingness to vote for him, provided the expense of proceeding to their M. A. degree were paid for them. We do not say (nor do we believe) that such a proposition would ever be likely to meet with encouragement, but the fact itself is sufficient to shew us the extent to which some men consider the system to have already arrived, and at least teaches us to guard against its ever attaining it."

OXFORD.

Degrees conferred April 5.

BACHELOR IN DIVINITY.

Wilson, Rev. John, Fellow of Trinity College, Grand Compounder.

MASTERS OF ARTS.

Alderson, James, Magdalen Hall, incorporated from Pembroke Hall, Camb.
Dunze, Rev. Sam. Henry, Brasenose Coll.
Eyre, Rev. C. Wasteneys, Brasenose Coll.
Roberson, W. H. Moncrieff, Lincoln Coll.
Stringer, Rev. Thos. Queen's College.
Tyrwhitt, Rev. Thomas, Christ Church.
Watson, George, Brasenose College.

BACHELORS OF ARTS.

Hughes, Wm. Hooker, Oriel College.
Vink, Chas. Geo. Fred. Magdalen Hall.

April 13.

BACHELOR IN MEDICINE, WITH LICENCE TO PRACTISE.

Alderson, James, Magdalen Hall.

MASTERS OF ARTS.

Crowdy, Anthony, Brasenose College.
Dawson, Edw. Oriel Coll. Grand Comp.
Dayman, J. Fellow of Corpus Christi Coll.
Gray, John Hamilton, Magdalen College.
Robinson, F. Scholar of Corpus C. Coll.
Wilson, John Alexander, Queen's College.

BACHELORS OF ARTS.

Aldridge, John, Christ Church.
Braham, Wm. S. Harris, Lincoln College.
Byrth, Rev. Thos. Magdalen Hall.
Oldershaw, Henry, Brasenose College.

April 20.

BACHELOR IN DIVINITY.

Jowett, Rev. Jas. Forbes, St. John's Coll.

MASTERS OF ARTS.

Amphlett, Rev. Joseph, Trinity College.
Crotch, Wm. R. Fellow of New College.
Gregory, Rev. Francis, Exeter College.
Young, Rev. Rd. Fellow of New College.

BACHELORS OF ARTS.

Alderman, Francis Chas. Exeter College.
Alfrey, W. Exeter Coll. Grand Compounder.
Appleton, Robert, Pembroke College.
Birch, Jas. Wheeler, Magdalen Hall.
Bowen, Perceval, All Souls College.
Brackenbury, Robert Carr, Lincoln Coll.
Brown, Henry, Balliol College.
Buller, Richard, Oriel College.
Burton, Henry, Christ Church.
Bussell, Wm. John, Pembroke College.

April 1.

Robert Isaac Wilberforce, B. A. and Richard Hurrell Froude, B. A. of Oriel College, were elected Fellows of that Society.

Mr. Robert John Rolles was admitted Scholar of New College.

April 5.

The Rev. G. C. Rashleigh, M. A. Fellow of New College, and the Rev. W. Harbin, M. A. Fellow of Wadham College, were admitted Proctors of the University; and the Rev. W. B. Lee, M. A. and the Rev. A. W. Hare, M. A. Fellows of New College; the Rev. Arthur Johnson, M. A. Fellow of Wadham College, and G. F. Thomas, M. A. of Worcester College, were nominated Pro-Proctors for the ensuing year.

April 11.

The Rev. H. H. Milman was elected Bampton Lecturer for the year 1827.

CAMBRIDGE.

Degrees conferred April 12.

DOCTOR IN DIVINITY.

Bland, Rev. Miles, St. John's College, Prebendary of Wells, Compounder.

MASTERS OF ARTS.

Dicken, C. R. Corpus Christi College.
 Jeffreys, Chas. Fellow of St. John's Coll.
 Russell, Wm. Fellow of Caius College.
 Stephenson, L. Fellow of St. John's Coll.
 Williams, Rev. J. C. Catharine Hall.
 Worral, Samuel, St. John's Coll. Comp.

BACHELORS OF ARTS.

Alvis, John Serjeant, Christ College.
 Branson, Henry John, Caius College.
 Brocas, Alfred, Emmanuel College.
 Dunn, John, St. John's College.
 Elwes, J. M. St. John's Coll. Compounder.
 Frost, Wm. Bird, Clare Hall.
 Hogg, Thomas C. St. John's College.
 Latham, Henry, St. John's College.
 Lindsell, Edw. Jesus Coll. Compounder.
 Lloyd, Owen, Trinity College.
 Neate, Arthur, Trinity Coll. Compounder.
 Sims, Henry Belmont, Trinity College.

April 7.

The subject of the Seatonian Prize Poem for the present year is, *The Transfiguration*.

MEMBERS' PRIZES.

Senior Bachelors.—Quales fuerunt antiquorum Philosophorum de animi immortalitate opiniones, et ex quânam origine ductæ?

Middle Bachelors.—Quibusnam præcipuè artibus, recentiores antiquos exsuperant?

PREFERMENTS.

The Right Rev. WILLIAM VAN MILDERT, LORD BISHOP OF LLANDAFF, to the Bishoprick of Durham.
 The Rev. C. R. Sumner, D. D. Prebend of Canterbury, and Chaplain to the King, to the Bishopric of Llandaff, and the Deanery of St. Paul's.
 Armstrong, M. to the Rectory of Shaw cum Donnington. Patron, Rev. Dr. Penrose.
 Barnard, Henry Watson, M. A. to the Vicarage of Compton Bassett.
 Beckwith, E. G. Ambrose, M. A. to a Minor Canonry in the Cathedral of St. Paul.
 Blackburne, Francis, to the Rectory of Weston super Mare.
 Bland, Miles, B. D. F. R. S. to a Prebendal Stall in the Cathedral of Wells. Patron, the Lord Bishop of Bath and Wells.
 Browne, T. A. to the Vicarage of Bilton, near York. Patron, the Prebend of Bilton.
 Clerke, Francis, M. A. to the Rectory of Eydon, Northamptonshire. Patron, The King.
 Cocks, the Hon. James Somers, M. A. Prebendary of Hereford, to the Perpetual Curacy of Stoughton, Worcestershire. Patron, Lord Somers.
 Conington, Richard, B. C. L. to the Rectory of Fishtoft, Lincolnshire. Patron, Francis Thirkill, Esq.

Cook, Bell, to the Perpetual Curacy of St. Paul and St. James annexed, Norwich. Patrons, the Dean and Chapter.

Dashwood, A. to the Rectory of Bintry with Themelthorpe annexed, Norwich. Patron, Sir Jacob Astley, Bart.

Davy, William, to the Vicarage of Winkleigh, Devon.

Day, George, M. A. to the Perpetual Curacy of Hemblington, Norfolk.

Gell, Thomas, M. A. to the Rectory of Preston Bagcott, Warwick. Patron, Mrs. Cartwright.

Girdlestone, C. M. A. Fellow of Balliol College, Oxford, to the Vicarage of Sedgley, near Wolverhampton. Patron, Lord Dudley and Ward.

Gleadow, T. R. to the Rectory of Frodesley, Shropshire.

Harris, J. to the Vicarage of Llanwynda, Pembrokeshire, and the Succentor's Stall in the Cathedral of St. David's.

Howes, Francis, M. A. to the Rectory of Alderford with Attlebridge, Norfolk. Patrons the Dean and Chapter of Norwich.

Jones, J. G. Master of the Grammar School, Stratford-on-Avon, to the Rectory of Saintbury. Patron, Jas. R. West, Esq.

Lewellin, L. M. A. Scholar of Jesus College, Oxford, to be Master of the Grammar School, of Bruton, Somerset.

Lloyd, John, to the Rectory of Llanyeil, in the Diocese of St. Asaph.

Lys, J. T. M. A. to the Rectory of Merton, Oxon. Patrons, the Rector and Fellows of Exeter College.

Marsham, Charles, to the Vicarage of Ilington, Devon.

Methwold, T. to the Rectory of Kilverstone, Suffolk. Patron, The King.

Mogridge, Wm. Henry, M. A. to the Perpetual Curacy of Wick, near Pershore, Worcestershire. Patron, the Rev. D'Arcy Haggitt.

Phillips, Robert, to the Rectory of Bettws, in the Diocese of St. Asaph.

Powys, Hon. Frederick, to the Rectory of Anchurch, with the Vicarage of Lilford annexed, Northamptonshire. Patron, Sir George Robertson, Bart.

Preston, Matthew Morris, M. A. to the Vicarage of Cheshunt, Herts. Patron, Francis Garratt, Esq.

Pulsford, Charles Henry, B. A. Prebend of Wells, to be Canon Residentiary of that Cathedral.

Randall, John, B. A. to the Vicarage of Tyonshall, Herefordshire.

Rice, E. M. A. to be alternate Morning Preacher at the Philanthropic Society's Chapel, London.

Richardson, R. W. to the Vicarage of Jeffreyaston, Pembrokeshire.

Spencer, T. M. A. Fellow of St. John's College, Cambridge, to the Perpetual Curacy of Charterhouse, Hinton, near Bath.

Thickins, John, Vicar of Exhall, near Coventry, to the Vicarage of Fillongley, Warwickshire. Patron, the Lord Chancellor.

Townsend, George, M. A. Prebendary of Durham, to the Rectory of Northallerton. Patrons the Dean and Chapter of Durham.

Warner, R. to the Rectory of Crocombe.

Webber, George Henry, B. A. Student of Christ Church, Oxford, to the Vicarage of Great Budworth, Cheshire. Patrons, the Dean and Chapter of Christ Church.

Webber, S. M. A. Rector of Fonthill Bishop, to the Vicarage of Tisbury, Wilts.

Whitehead, W. B. Vicar of Chard, to the Vicarage of Timberscombe, Somerset.

Williams, Peter, to the Rectory of Llangar, in the Diocese of St. Asaph.

Wodsworth, C. M. A. to the Rectory of Ingoldthorpe, Norfolk. Patron, the Rev. T. L. Cooper.

Worsley, Thomas, M. A. Fellow and Tutor of Downing College, to the Rectory of Scawton, Yorkshire.

CLERGYMEN MARRIED.

Adams, H. L. to Mary, daughter of Wm. Plumbridge, Esq. of Southover, Sussex.

Bateman, R. Rector of Silton, Dorset, to Frances, eldest daughter of the late Bestan Mitford, Esq.

Bennett, J. T. to Eliza, eldest daughter of the late J. Jackson, Esq. of Doncaster.

Best, S. third son of the Lord Chief Justice of the Common Pleas, to Charlotte, youngest daughter of the Hon. Mr. Justice Burrough.

Blackstone, F. Chas. B. C. L. Rector of Worthing, to Elizabeth, daughter of the late Charles Ranken, Esq.

Browne, T. A. Vicar of Bilton, to Barbara, eldest daughter of the late Rev. C. Preston.

Fryer, W. Vicar of Cam, Gloucestershire, to Ann Augusta, eldest daughter of G. Harris, Esq. of Oaklands, near Dursley.

Hastings, H. James, M. A. to Elizabeth, youngest daughter of the late J. Whitacre, Esq. of Woodhouse, near Huddersfield.

Higginson, H., M. A. to Harriet, daughter of the late J. H. Cassamajor, Esq.

Holdsworth, Thos. C. to Miss Leader, of Brightwell House, near Sheffield.

Nayler, Thomas, Chaplain to the Duke of York, to Dora, second daughter of Sir G. Nayler.

Newman, Thomas, Rector of Alresford, to Mary Anne, only daughter of the late R. R. Mills, Esq. of Colchester.

Pellew, Hon. Ed. to Mary Anne, daughter of the late Dr. Winthrop.

Perceval, Henry, M. A. Rector of Charlton, Kent, to Catherine Isabella, daughter of A. B. Drummond, Esq. of Cadland, Hampshire.

Rees, D. to Christian St. Barke, only daughter of James Randolph, Esq.

Rogers, H. to Sarah, eldest daughter of the late W. Phelps, Esq. of East Pennard, Somerset.

Sherer, George, M. A. Vicar of Marshfield, Gloucestershire, to Mary Anne, fourth daughter of the late J. W. Wallinger, Esq.

CLERGYMEN DECEASED.

Batt, W. Rector of Botesfleeming, Devon.

Baxter, Thomas, B. A. of St. John's College, Cambridge.

Bedford, F. Rector of Belchford, Lincolnsh.

Bolton, John M. Curate of Hemblington, Norfolk, aged 34.

Carter, R. W., M. A. Curate of Ickworth, Suffolk, and Rector of Quarrington, Lincolnshire, aged 62.

Frankland, Roger, M. A. Canon Residentiary of Wells.

Goodenough, R. P. M. A. Prebend. of York.

Haines, W. Rector of West Tanfield, Yorkshire, aged 60.

Jackson, J. M. A. Head Master of North-leach school, Gloucestershire, aged 24.

Llewellyn, Rice, Vicar of Tollesbury, Essex

Lough, J. Vicar of Sittingbourn, aged 69.

Owen, Owen, M. A. Rector of Langiniu, Montgomery, aged 76.

Pettingall, Thomas, B. D. Rector of East Hampstead, Berks, aged 82.

Sandiford, C. M. A. Archdeacon of Wells, and Vicar of Acore and Blakeney, and of Tirley, Gloucestershire.

Say, W. T. B. C. L. Vicar of Rainham, Essex, and of Amwell, Herts, aged, 60.

Varenne, Joseph, B. D. Rector of Staplehurst, Kent, and Vicar of Grays Thurrock, Essex.

NOTICES TO CORRESPONDENTS.

We have received H. G.'s Letter; but we fear its admission into our columns would produce but little effect. They who are so ignorant or unmindful of their duty as to refuse to register private Baptisms are not likely to profit by our pages.

Our thanks are due for a Sermon on "the Duty of Praise."

We cannot assent to the proposition, which was contained in the remarks sent to us on the Review of Mr. Hook's Consecration Sermon, that absentees do not injure their country by spending their income abroad, although it is proved by Sir Henry Parvelli, Mr. McCulloch, and the Edinburgh Review. It would be foreign from the object of this publication to discuss the question.

We have received a Review of a Sermon, by the Rev. James Walker, M. A.